



**This electronic thesis or dissertation has been
downloaded from Explore Bristol Research,
<http://research-information.bristol.ac.uk>**

Author:

Collins, Matthew A

Title:

Shifting perspectives : (re-)evaluating the use of sobriquets in the Qumran Dead Sea scrolls

General rights

Access to the thesis is subject to the Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International Public License. A copy of this may be found at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode> This license sets out your rights and the restrictions that apply to your access to the thesis so it is important you read this before proceeding.

Take down policy

Some pages of this thesis may have been removed for copyright restrictions prior to having it been deposited in Explore Bristol Research. However, if you have discovered material within the thesis that you consider to be unlawful e.g. breaches of copyright (either yours or that of a third party) or any other law, including but not limited to those relating to patent, trademark, confidentiality, data protection, obscenity, defamation, libel, then please contact collections-metadata@bristol.ac.uk and include the following information in your message:

- Your contact details
- Bibliographic details for the item, including a URL
- An outline nature of the complaint

Your claim will be investigated and, where appropriate, the item in question will be removed from public view as soon as possible.

Shifting Perspectives: (Re-)evaluating the Use of Sobriquets in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls

Matthew A. Collins

A dissertation submitted to the University of Bristol in accordance with the
requirements of the degree of Ph.D. in the Faculty of Arts.

Department of Theology and Religious Studies. September 2006.

Word Count: Seventy three thousand, three hundred and fifty four.

Abstract

This thesis constitutes an examination of key sobriquets found among the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls. Acknowledging the problematic nature of attempting to identify historical referents behind these epithets, the primary focus of this study is literary rather than historical and concentrates on the function of the sobriquets as labels utilised positively or negatively within the sectarian compositions.

Noting the presence of both 'standard' and 'variant' forms of these designations, this thesis sets out to examine the differing form and function of the sobriquets across the range of texts in which they appear. More specifically, it attempts to demonstrate that over time they underwent a developmental process, changing in form and perhaps denotation. Adopting a chronological schema that posits a Formative, Early and Late Sectarian Layer, and concentrating on the sobriquets 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie', this investigation observes a development from contextualised scriptural typologies towards titular forms constituting discrete elements of sectarian terminology. A more general evolutionary trend towards a definite ('standard') form is also highlighted, with the so-called variants representing earlier stages in this process (further demonstrated by means of a supplementary case study involving the group sobriquet, 'the Seekers of Smooth Things').

Comparison of these results with sociological insights, drawing upon the sociology of deviance and 'labelling theory', suggests that this phenomenon can be understood against a wider context of labelling practices. Thus it is demonstrated that the sobriquets function as tools for labelling deviance and affirming positive counterparts. Furthermore, it is suggested that the move towards definite titular forms reflects a process of role engulfment, increased prototypicality and the ultimate acquisition of 'master status'.

Acknowledgements

I must first thank my supervisor, Dr. Jonathan Campbell, for his guidance and support, as well as his diligent scrutiny of draft chapters and willingness to discuss at length issues arising from my research. I am also extremely grateful to Dr. John Lyons, Dr. Lloyd Pietersen, Professor George Brooke, Professor Philip Davies and Professor Ida Fröhlich for their comments and encouragement at various stages throughout the production of this thesis. Naturally, responsibility for its content remains my own.

To Lionel Swain I owe a debt of gratitude for first setting me on this path, and I am similarly grateful to Kathryn Gardner for the many caffeine-fuelled discussions which have come to influence the shape of this study. Thanks are also due to my colleagues and students in the department of Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Bristol, and likewise my friends and flatmates, all of whom have helped in various ways while this thesis was being prepared and for which they are much appreciated. In particular, I am grateful to Adrian Benson and Dave Stockdale for their assistance with the practicalities of bringing this work to completion.

Finally, special thanks must go to my family and Claire, who have patiently endured my preoccupation with my research and have kept me going throughout the more difficult patches. Without their support the road would have been far rockier, and accordingly it is to them that this work is dedicated.

Author's Declaration

I declare that the work in this dissertation was carried out in accordance with the Regulations of the University of Bristol. The work is original except where indicated by special reference in the text and no part of the dissertation has been submitted for any other degree.

Any views expressed in the dissertation are those of the author and in no way represent those of the University of Bristol.

The dissertation has not been presented to any other University for examination either in the United Kingdom or overseas.

SIGNED:.....

DATE:20/09/06.....

Contents

Abbreviations	xi
Key to Symbols in Translated Passages	xiii

INTRODUCTION	1
--------------	---

CHAPTER ONE: The Sobriquets and the Scrolls	5
---	---

1.1. Introduction	5
-------------------	---

1.2. Contextualising the Scrolls	6
----------------------------------	---

1.2.1. Dating the Scrolls	6
---------------------------	---

1.2.2. An Overview of Scholarly Hypotheses	8
--	---

1.2.2.1. The Second Century BCE	8
---------------------------------	---

<i>Pre-Maccabaeon Hypotheses</i>	8
----------------------------------	---

<i>Mainstream Qumran-Essene Hypotheses</i>	11
--	----

<i>The Groningen Hypothesis</i>	13
---------------------------------	----

1.2.2.2. The First Century BCE	14
--------------------------------	----

<i>Hasmonaeon Hypotheses</i>	14
------------------------------	----

<i>Hasmonaeon-Jerusalem Hypotheses</i>	15
--	----

1.2.2.3. The First Century CE	16
-------------------------------	----

<i>Christian-Related Hypotheses</i>	16
-------------------------------------	----

<i>The Zealot-Qumran Hypothesis</i>	17
-------------------------------------	----

1.2.3. The Problems with a 'Naïve Historicism'	18
--	----

1.3. Re-evaluating the Use of Sobriquets in the Scrolls	22
---	----

1.3.1. The Nature and Function of the Qumran Sobriquets	22
--	----

1.3.2. The Origins of the Qumran Sobriquets	27
---	----

1.3.3. Hypothesis and Method	32
1.4. Chronologically Ordering the Key Texts	34
1.4.1. Texts under Consideration	34
1.4.2. The Problems with a Chronological Schema	36
1.4.3. Layering the Texts	40
1.5. Conclusions	44
 CHAPTER TWO: Formative Sectarian Layer	46
2.1. Introduction	46
2.2. Sobriquets in the Formative Sectarian Layer	47
2.2.1. The (Pre-Yahadic) Damascus Document	47
2.2.1.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'	47
<i>CD 6.2-11a</i>	47
2.2.1.2. 'The Spouter of the Lie'	57
<i>CD.5.20 – 6.2</i>	57
2.3. Conclusions	60
 CHAPTER THREE: Early Sectarian Layer	64
3.1. Introduction	64
3.2. Sobriquets in the Early Sectarian Layer	65
3.2.1. The (Yahadic) Damascus Document	65
3.2.1.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'	65
<i>CD 1.4-11a</i>	65
<i>CD 19.33b – 20.1a</i>	72
<i>CD 20.13-15</i>	77
<i>CD 20.27-34</i>	79
<i>Summary</i>	81

3.2.1.2. 'The Spouter of the Lie'	82
<i>CD 1.10-18a</i>	82
<i>CD 4.19-20</i>	88
<i>CD 8.12-13 / 19.24b-26a</i>	91
<i>CD 20.10-15</i>	94
<i>Summary</i>	101
3.2.1.3. Sobriquets in the (Yahadic) Damascus Document	103
3.2.2. The Hodayot	104
3.2.2.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'	104
<i>1QH^a 7.17b-22a [15.14-19]</i>	104
<i>1QH^a 10.13-15a [2.13-15a]</i>	108
<i>1QH^a 12.23b-25a [4.23b-25a]</i>	111
<i>1QH^a 16.16-17 [8.16-17]</i>	113
<i>Summary</i>	118
3.2.2.2. 'The Spouter of the Lie'	121
<i>1QH^a 10.9b-11 [2.9b-11]</i>	121
<i>1QH^a 10.13-17a [2.13-17a]</i>	125
<i>1QH^a 10.31b-34a [2.31b-34a]</i>	127
<i>1QH^a 12.6b-11a [4.6b-11a]</i>	131
<i>1QH^a 12.14b-20 [4.14b-20]</i>	135
<i>Summary</i>	141
3.2.2.3. Sobriquets in the Hodayot	144
3.2.3. 4QCommentary on Genesis A	146
3.2.3.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'	146
<i>4Q252 5.1-7</i>	146
3.3. Conclusions	153

CHAPTER FOUR: Late Sectarian Layer	157
4.1. Introduction	157
4.2. Sobriquets in the Late Sectarian Layer	158
4.2.1. 1QPesher on Habakkuk	158
4.2.1.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’	158
<i>1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a</i>	158
<i>1QpHab 5.8-12</i>	163
<i>1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a</i>	165
<i>1QpHab 9.8-12a</i>	170
<i>1QpHab 11.2-8</i>	172
<i>Summary</i>	175
4.2.1.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’	176
<i>1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a</i>	176
<i>1QpHab 5.8-12</i>	182
<i>1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a</i>	184
<i>Summary</i>	190
<i>Excursus: ‘The Wicked Priest’</i>	192
4.2.1.3. Sobriquets in 1QPesher on Habakkuk	196
4.2.2. 1QPesher on Micah	198
4.2.2.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’	198
<i>1Q14 frags 8-10, 1b-9a</i>	198
4.2.2.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’	200
<i>1Q14 frags 8-10, 1b-9a</i>	200
4.2.2.3. Sobriquets in 1QPesher on Micah	202
4.2.3. 4QPesher on Isaiah^c	203
4.2.3.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’	203
<i>4Q163 frag.21, 1-6</i>	203
4.2.3.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’	204
<i>4Q163 frags 4-6, 1.6-10</i>	204
4.2.3.3. Sobriquets in 4QPesher on Isaiah^c	205

4.2.4. 4QPesher on Psalms ^a	206
4.2.4.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’	206
4Q171 1.25 – 2.1	206
4Q171 3.14-19	208
4Q171 4.26b – 5.2	213
Summary	213
4.2.4.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’	214
4Q171 1.25 – 2.1	214
4Q171 4.13-16	217
Summary	218
Excursus: ‘The Wicked Priest’	219
4.2.4.3. Sobriquets in 4QPesher on Psalms ^a	221
4.2.5. 4QUnidentified Pesher Fragments	222
4.2.5.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’	222
4Q172 frag.7, 1-2	222
4.2.6. 4QPesher on Psalms ^b	222
4.2.6.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’	222
4Q173 frag.1, 4-5	222
4Q173 frag.2, 1-2	224
Summary	224
4.2.7. 4QCatena A	225
4.2.7.1. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’	225
4Q177 1.6-10	225
4.3. Conclusions	227
 CHAPTER FIVE: The Development of the Qumran Sobriquets	 230
5.1. Introduction	230

5.2. The Evidence for Sobriquet Development	231
5.2.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ and ‘the Spouter of the Lie’	231
5.2.2. ‘The Seekers of Smooth Things’	236
5.2.2.1. The Formative Sectarian Layer	236
5.2.2.2. The Early Sectarian Layer	239
5.2.2.3. The Late Sectarian Layer	240
5.2.3. Sobriquets across the Scrolls	243
5.2.4. The Problems with this Model	245
5.3. The Qumran Sobriquets and the Sociology of Deviance	248
5.3.1. Sociological Approaches to the Scrolls	248
5.3.2. The Sociology of Deviance and Labelling Theory	250
5.3.3. The Qumran Sobriquets and the Acquisition of Master Status	254
5.4. Conclusions	260
 CONCLUSIONS	 263
 BIBLIOGRAPHY	 268

Abbreviations

<i>AJS</i>	<i>American Journal of Sociology</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Antiquities</i> (Josephus: Loeb Classical Library)
<i>ARSSR</i>	<i>Annual Review of the Social Sciences of Religion</i>
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
<i>DJD(J)</i>	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Jordan)
<i>DSD</i>	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
<i>DSSR</i>	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls Reader</i> (Parry and Tov (eds) 2004)
<i>DSSSE</i>	<i>Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition</i> (García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds) 1997-98)
<i>EI</i>	<i>Eretz-Israel</i>
<i>ESL</i>	Early Sectarian Layer
<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
<i>FSL</i>	Formative Sectarian Layer
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>IOQS</i>	International Organization for Qumran Studies
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JRH</i>	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>
<i>JSIJ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies, an Internet Journal</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>LSL</i>	Late Sectarian Layer
<i>LXX</i>	Septuagint

MT	Masoretic Text
<i>NRSV</i>	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i> (of the Bible)
<i>PIBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association</i>
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
<i>QC</i>	<i>Qumran Chronicle</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
SHS	Scripture and Hermeneutics Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SVT	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
<i>SocRel</i>	<i>Sociology of Religion</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>War</i>	<i>Jewish War</i> (Josephus: Loeb Classical Library)
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für de Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

Key to Symbols in Translated Passages¹

] XXX [or] NNN [

legible text

[XXX] or [NNN]

text restoration

] ... [

one or more illegible traces or untranslatable readings

[...]

lacuna of unspecified length

(XXX)

words supplied by way of explanation

(NNN)

suggested or alternative reading

(...)

omission in translation

{/XXX}

alternative translation for immediately preceding word(s)

{NNN}

underlying Hebrew text for immediately preceding word(s) in translation

¹ Largely following, though not entirely identical with, those presented in *DSSSE* (García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds) 1997, pp.xx-xxi).

Introduction

It is now nearly sixty years since Muhammad edh-Dhib purportedly clambered into a cave close to the north-western shore of the Dead Sea and discovered a hoard of ancient manuscripts. In doing so he sparked a series of similar discoveries in the area, a lengthy publication process and a debate about the origin of these texts which still rages today.¹ The ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’, as they have popularly become known, include discoveries from sites such as Wadi Murabba‘at, Naḥal Hever and Wadi ed-Daliyeh.² However, we shall concern ourselves solely with the Qumran (or better, Qumran-related) Dead Sea Scrolls, those texts coming from the eleven caves commonly associated with the site of Khirbet Qumran.³

The remains of some nine hundred manuscripts have been recovered (bearing witness to “around four hundred distinct compositions”; Campbell 2002, p.10), and include previously known works classed as biblical, apocryphal or pseudepigraphal in nature.⁴ Further to these are hitherto unknown texts (with the exception of the Damascus Document; see Levy 1993) some of which are regarded as ‘sectarian’, the literary creations of the ‘sect’ deemed responsible for the collection as a whole.⁵ One prominent feature used to distinguish ‘sectarian’

¹ For the oft-repeated account(s) of this discovery, see: Campbell 2002, pp.1-12; Schiffman 1994, pp.3-16; Shanks 1999, pp.3-32; VanderKam 1994a, pp.1-12. For detailed summaries of the publication saga, see primarily: Harding 2002; Schiffman 2002; Schuller 2006, pp.1-33; Shanks 1999, pp.33-60; Trompf 2002. Theories of origin will be discussed briefly in Chapter One.

² See, Campbell 2002, pp.19-21. Note further: Eshel and Cotton 2000a; 2000b; Fields 2000; Lapp and Gropp 2000; Magness, Eshel and Talmon 2000; Patrich 2000; Pfann 2000; Stern and Eshel 2000.

³ Unless otherwise qualified, for this thesis the term ‘Dead Sea Scrolls’ will refer solely to the Qumran-related collection of manuscripts (thus often including, by association, the mediaeval copies of the Damascus Document from Cairo). Cf. Talmon 1994a, pp.7-8.

⁴ See Dimant 2000.

⁵ It is unclear how many sects (if any) may be represented by this apparent ‘sectarian’ literature. See primarily the following discussions: Charlesworth and Knibb 2000; Collins 2003; 2006;

from ‘non-sectarian’ texts is the presence of so-called ‘community terminology’.⁶ Most notably this includes the employment of sobriquets, such as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה הצדק), ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (מטף הכזב) and ‘the Wicked Priest’ (הכוהן הרשע).⁷

The predominant approach to this phenomenon has been to attempt to identify the historical personages deemed to lie behind these nicknames.⁸ However, after sixty years and countless proffered reconstructions, disagreement abounds within the scholarly community concerning these varied proposals. Indeed, some scholars have become increasingly critical either about the possibility of reading or reconstructing history from these texts (e.g. Brooke 1994a; Davies 1987) or in their approach towards such a goal (Grossman 2002). Nevertheless, the traditional method (indicative of a “naïve historicism”; Brooke 1994a, p.345) is still prevalent (e.g. Gmirkin 2000).

With the imminent completion of the DJD series and unprecedented availability of the Qumran-related material (e.g. *DSSR*; *DSSSE*; *PTSDSSP*), the time is ripe for a re-evaluation of the sobriquets themselves in terms of their use and function within the texts. In recent years some scholars have indeed begun to

Davies 1994; 1996, pp.139-150; Golb 1995; Grossman 2002, pp.24-41; Metso 2006; Regev 2003. As will be elaborated upon in Chapter One, given the “surprisingly homogeneous” (van der Woude 1998, p.3) nature of the texts, this thesis assumes the existence of (at least) one discernible group behind the collection. Furthermore, if scholars such as Davies (1983), García Martínez (1995a) and Murphy-O’Connor (1974) are right to posit two related groups, one having sprung from the other, we may suppose that the origins and development of the earlier might nevertheless form part of the later group’s perceived history (even if they were to expressly define themselves over and against the parent group). Thus we are able to speak of a broad ‘sectarian’ movement whose history (including internal divisions) may be represented by the Qumran-related scrolls. In these circumstances however, the final shape of the collection and the perspectives contained therein remain ultimately representative of the later group. For a recent examination of the employment of ‘sect’-terminology in scholarship on the scrolls and the difficulties this raises, see Jokiranta 2001.

⁶ Indeed, Devorah Dimant employs this as the *sole* criterion for distinction (1995; 2000). This approach is problematic however as it: (i) does not allow for fragmentary manuscripts which may at one time have attested such terminology, (ii) makes an unfounded assumption that *all* sectarian texts would have utilised it, and (iii) cannot objectively identify what would and would not constitute ‘community terminology’. A broader approach is therefore required (see further, Davies 2005, pp.71-73; Jokiranta 2001, pp.236-238).

⁷ Cf. Bengtsson 2000a, pp.8-11; 2000b, p.243; Callaway 1988, p.135.

⁸ To be discussed further in Chapter One.

address this issue, notably Håkan Bengtsson (2000a; 2000b) and Ida Fröhlich (1999; 2004). Bengtsson's major study (2000a) however, while commendable with regard to its level of detail and sensitivity to inter-textual connections, confines itself primarily to the sobriquets as they appear in the pesharim. Though he notes the possibility that 'variant' forms in other texts might represent different developmental stages (2000a, pp.3, 95; so too Fröhlich 1999, p.300, n.33), the issue of their precise relation to those found in the pesharim is left largely unexplored.

By contrast this present study sets out to examine the differing form and function of the sobriquets across the range of texts in which they appear. More particularly, given the traditionally allotted time-span for sectarian composition and the evidence for ideological development attested by the texts, this study hypothesises that the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process, changing in form and perhaps meaning and/or referent. It further speculates that this process might be evidenced within the scrolls themselves if examined in a manner sensitive to the varied composition dates of the texts and with particular reference to the precise forms taken by the sobriquets where they appear. The specific question under consideration therefore is whether convincing evidence of such development can indeed be found in the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls.

In terms of overall structure, Chapter One will constitute an overview of scholarly work to date on the sobriquets. Then, focussing on 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie', we will examine the form and function of these designations against a particular chronological schema, based primarily upon the work of Philip Davies regarding the redaction history of the Damascus Document (1983) and the relationship between the Hodayot and the various pesharim (1987, pp.87-105). Thus we shall consider in turn a 'Formative Sectarian Layer' (Chapter Two), 'Early Sectarian Layer' (Chapter Three) and 'Late Sectarian Layer' (Chapter Four). Chapter Five will comprise both an analysis of our results and a comparison with insights garnered from a sociological approach, specifically one drawing upon the sociology of deviance

and ‘labelling theory’. In this manner we will seek independent confirmation of this thesis’ findings, examining their compliance with research carried out in another academic field. Finally, in our conclusions, we shall highlight the implications of this study and suggest new avenues for investigation.

In order to ensure consistency and accuracy with regard to the rendering of sobriquets and related terminology, all translations from the scrolls are essentially the present author’s revisions of *DSSSE* (though indebted also to the official DJD publications, the PTSDSSP series, *DSSR*, and the insights of García Martínez (1996) Vermes (2004) and Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996); any errors remain my own). Column and line numbering is likewise taken from *DSSSE*. Biblical references and Hebrew follow *BHS*, while translations are based upon *NRSV* (though with minor alterations for terminological consistency and with inclusive language reversed where this provides a more accurate rendering in the context). All references to the works of Josephus are from the Loeb Classical Library edition.

1.

The Sobriquets and the Scrolls

1.1. Introduction

Nearly sixty years have passed since the discovery of the first Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 and during this time numerous theories have been proposed concerning the origin of this enigmatic find. Most assume the existence of a discernible movement behind the collection and tend to link the scrolls in some way with the nearby site of Khirbet Qumran. Such theories have often sought to identify this group either by comparing what we learn ideologically (or theologically) from the texts themselves with Jewish religious groups known to have existed at the time or by attempting to match up apparent historical references in the scrolls with known historical events from the Second Temple period. Central to most of these reconstructions have been the so-called Qumran sobriquets, ‘nicknames’ that occur with some frequency among the sectarian texts and are commonly taken to denote key individuals or groups in the life or history of the sect.¹ Indeed, many have considered that unlocking the identity of such principal characters as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה) and ‘the Wicked Priest’ (הכוהן הרשע) might be the key to unravelling the origins of the scrolls.

As a result, attempts to identify the referents of the sobriquets have been at the heart of most historical reconstructions and have formed the basis of numerous and varied hypotheses. Largely, however, these approaches have been inconclusive and have not led to a widespread consensus. Instead, the field of Qumran studies is littered with the debris of hard-fought, often bitter, battles over

¹ For a detailed discussion of the function and characteristic features of the Qumran sobriquets, see primarily Bengtsson 2000a (esp. pp.1-50).

the identity of the sect.² Some theories have fallen, others continue to be vigorously defended, but none have survived unscathed. Many scholars have found themselves forced to adapt and refine their arguments in response to either the discovery or publication of new evidence or, more often than not, the criticisms of other scholars. This state of flux can make it quite difficult to outline the different major hypotheses in anything other than broad brushstrokes. Nevertheless, in this chapter we shall first endeavour an overview of these attempts to ‘contextualise’ the scrolls before examining the problems with such an approach. Subsequently we shall turn our attention to the nature of the sobriquets themselves and propose a fresh line of enquiry, one concerned with the apparent ‘variant’ forms and the possibility of sobriquet development. Finally we shall attempt to chronologically layer key sectarian material as a backdrop to our investigation. Let us therefore begin by surveying the major scholarly hypotheses proposed since the scrolls’ discovery, regarding the identification of the movement responsible and the referents of the sobriquets.

1.2. Contextualising the Scrolls

1.2.1. Dating the Scrolls

A combination of textual and archaeological evidence allows us to establish a general time-span of some two hundred and fifty years or more in which to seek a historical context for the collection, ranging roughly from 200 BCE to 70 CE.³ Dating of sample scrolls by palaeography and Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (Carbon-14) reveals that most appear to have been written within this period, though this of course only provides a *terminus ad quem* for their composition.⁴ The AMS date of 1QpHab (sometime in the first century BCE) is

² It should be noted that, as Schiffman points out, the battle over the identity of the sect is just one of many ‘battles of the scrolls’ that have been fought, including not least that over “the publication of the texts and access to them for scholarly research” (Schiffman 2002, p.157).

³ These termini, in particular the former, can however vary greatly in the eyes of individual scholars, allowing, for example, for an antecedent history of the movement (see the varied hypotheses below).

⁴ See Avigad 1958; Birnbaum 1951; Cross 1976; 1998; 2000. Israel Carmi has conducted a comparison of the various compiled palaeographic and AMS results, concluding that there is

particularly significant as it has been taken to indicate a latest possible date for the existence of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’, ‘the Wicked Priest’ and ‘the Spouter of the Lie’, one that is notably prior to the Christian era.⁵ In addition, the few people who are mentioned by name in the scrolls are likely from the second or first centuries BCE: e.g. אֱלִיָּהוּ (4Q169 frags 3-4, 1.2); אֱלִיָּהוּ (1.3); יוֹחָנָן (4Q331 frag.1, 1.7) שלִמְצִיּוֹן (4Q331 frag.1, 2.7; 4Q332 frag.2, 4); הֶרְקֵנוֹס (4Q332 frag.2, 6); אֱמֶלִיּוֹס (4Q333 frag.1, 4, 8); יוֹנָתָן (4Q448 B.2; C.8).⁶

Archaeological evidence from Khirbet Qumran has yielded a general consensus that, following an initial settlement in the eighth or seventh centuries BCE, the site was re-inhabited *around* 100 BCE (though this date often varies in scholarly hypotheses by up to fifty years either way) and occupied until its destruction by the Romans in 68 CE (a date that is also presented variously). Roland de Vaux, who led the initial excavation, believed that the ruins were those of an Essene ‘monastery’ inhabited by the writers of the scrolls between c.130 BCE and 68 CE (1973). However, his failure to produce an official site report has prompted scholars to review the evidence in recent years (e.g. Galor, Humbert and Zangenberg (eds) 2006) and in some cases arrive at very different conclusions regarding either the interpretation of the site (Donceel and Donceel-Voûte 1994; Donceel-Voûte 1993; Golb 1994; 1995; Hirschfeld 2000; 2004; 2006) or the dates of occupation (Magness 1998; 2000; 2002).

De Vaux suggested, on rather scanty evidence, that the site had been inhabited on a smaller scale for a short period in the latter half of the second century BCE (Period Ia; roughly 130-100 BCE).⁷ Jodi Magness disagrees, rejecting the existence of Period Ia entirely (claiming it to be the product of de Vaux’s

generally “excellent agreement” between them all (2000, p.888; so too Broshi 2004). Other scholars are rather more cautious, taking into consideration the severe limitations of these methods (Callaway 1994; Doudna 1998; 2006). Cf. Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002, pp.68-75.

⁵ For a reassessment of the AMS results, defending the possibility of a first century CE origin, see Atwill and Braunheim with Eisenman 2004.

⁶ Cf. Abegg 2002 (esp. pp.234-235); Wise 1994.

⁷ De Vaux 1973.

desire to date the occupation of Qumran as close as possible to the reign of Jonathan Maccabee) and presents a revised chronology, arguing that the site was only inhabited from the first half of the first century BCE (Magness 2002, esp. pp.63-69).⁸ De Vaux also claimed that an earthquake in 31 BCE (cf. *Ant.* 15.121-122; *War* 1.370-372) caused the site to be abandoned for about thirty years, being reoccupied only at the beginning of the first century CE. Magness however, noting the limited damage done by the earthquake, suggests that the inhabitants continued to live there until forced to leave when the site was apparently burned in 9/8 BCE, returning to Qumran around 4 BCE (1998, pp.57-59; 2002; pp.66-69). On the other hand, James Charlesworth argues that the site was abandoned as early as 40 BCE, at the time of the Parthian invasion, and left vacant for nearly forty years (2002, pp.50-52). According to the consensus view, the next phase of occupation (Period II) began around the turn of the era and lasted until June of 68 CE when the Romans destroyed the site and used it themselves as an outpost for a short time (Period III).

The result of this combined textual and archaeological evidence is that a context for the history of those responsible for the scrolls has been sought chiefly within the second and first centuries BCE (and to some extent the first century CE), drawing upon the historical framework provided by the books of Maccabees and the works of Josephus.⁹ It is to these proposals that we now turn.

1.2.2. An Overview of Scholarly Hypotheses

1.2.2.1. The Second Century BCE

Pre-Maccabaeon Hypotheses

In 1952, with only the evidence of Cave 1 and the Cairo Damascus Document (CD; see Schechter 1970) at his disposal, H.H. Rowley tentatively proposed that ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ be identified with the deposed

⁸ It is worth noting that Charlesworth (2002, pp.37-62) attempts to resurrect de Vaux’s chronology, but does so rather unconvincingly in the opinion of this thesis.

⁹ As shall be explored below, the inherent assumption that such ‘historical’ works contain an accurate portrayal of events is problematic, especially given the presence of conflicting accounts.

Zadokite High Priest, Onias III (190-175/4 BCE).¹⁰ After being supplanted by his brother, Jason, in 175/4 BCE, Onias was forced into exile where, in 171/70 BCE, he was murdered at the instigation of Jason's successor, Menelaus (172-162 BCE). It is this latter, non-Zadokite High Priest, that Rowley identifies as 'the Wicked Priest' of the pesharim, while suggesting that the Seleucid king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 BCE), should be considered 'the Man of Scoffing' / 'the Spouter of the Lie' (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן / מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב); Rowley equates the two sobriquets on the basis of CD 1.14-15).¹¹ He also suggests that the reference in 1QPesher on Habakkuk to 'the House of Absalom' (בֵּית אַבְשָׁלוֹם; 1QpHab 5.8-12) might refer to the largely pro-Seleucid Tobiad family, who were intermarried with the priestly Oniad line yet without access to the High Priesthood (1952a, p.69; 1952b, p.383).

New evidence, arising from the discovery of further Qumran-related material in Caves 2-11, was soon incorporated by Rowley so as to support his proposed Onias-Menelaus-Antiochus context for the scrolls.¹² With regard to 4QPesher on Nahum, he suggested that the Demetrius mentioned was Demetrius I Soter (162-151/50 BCE) and that 'the Lion of Wrath' (כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן; frags 3-4, 1.5-6; cf. 4Q167 frag.2, 2) be identified with:

either Antiochus [IV] himself, or, more probably, his agent who was in charge of his affairs in Palestine, and who carried through with such ferocity the persecution ordered by the king. (Rowley 1956, p.193)

More recently, and with the entire body of evidence now available, Russell Gmirkin has agreed with Rowley's central tenet, that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' should be identified with Onias III and 'the Wicked Priest' with Menelaus (Gmirkin 1998; 2000; cf. Pfann 2004). However, Gmirkin emphasises what he perceives to be the Hasidic nature of the scrolls, arguing that Onias was the leader of the conservative Hasidim. He consequently identifies the group's

¹⁰ Rowley 1952a (esp. pp.62-70); 1952b.

¹¹ Rowley 1952a, pp.67-70.

¹² See Rowley 1958, pp.137-146.

opponents, ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’ (דורשי החלקות), with the pro-Hellenists and their apparent leader, ‘the Man of the Lie’ (איש הכוזב), with Jason (Gmirkin 2000, pp.493-494).

A variation on this hypothesis is that of Paul Rainbow (1997), who begins by examining Josephus’ two accounts regarding the founding of the temple at Leontopolis in 162 BCE.¹³ He makes a convincing argument for doubting the identification of Josephus’ Onias (IV?) as the son of Onias III, claiming instead that this man (who he surnames Egypticus for purposes of distinction) was the son of Simon, the administrator of the temple (2 Macc. 3.4; 4.1; 4.23), and therefore also the nephew of Menelaus. Rainbow claims that Josephus, working from records that Menelaus had falsified in order to present himself as Onias III’s brother and therefore a legitimate claimant to the High Priesthood (*Ant.* 12.237-239, 387; 20.235-236), inaccurately deduced that the Onias responsible for the temple at Leontopolis, known to be Menelaus’ nephew, was therefore the son of Onias III.¹⁴ Assuming the tradition that Onias III did indeed have a son to be true however, Rainbow speculates as to his career. Naming him Simon III (following the alternating binary tradition of the Oniad family), he proposes an identification with ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ and seemingly suggests that Jonathan Maccabee should be identified with ‘the Wicked Priest’ (Rainbow 1997, pp.44-52). This view has the support of Émile Puech, who posits further that Simon III may have been the High Priest during the apparent ‘intersacerdotium’ (159-152 BCE; Puech 1999; 2005).

¹³ In direct contradiction with his account in *Antiquities* that Onias III’s son, Onias IV, built the temple at Leontopolis (12.387-388; 13.62-73), in his *Jewish War* Josephus attributes the building of the temple to Onias III himself, who did not die but went into exile, not to Daphne but to Egypt (*War* 1.31-33; 7.421f.). Given this confusion, some scholars have begun to doubt the existence of Onias IV, positing instead that he was a later invention to cover-up the fact that Onias III himself built the rival temple; an act that would have been of questionable legitimacy (Grabbe 1994, pp.280-281; Soggin 1999, pp.338-339). The revised Schürer, on the other hand, highlights the role of Daniel 9.26 and 11.22 in appearing to confirm the version in 2 Maccabees 4.7-10, 33-34 (Schürer with Vermes and Millar 1973, pp.148-150, see n.27 and n.30).

¹⁴ That Onias IV/Egypticus was the son of Simon the temple administrator may also explain why, in his other account, Josephus mistakenly identifies him with Onias III, son of Simon II (*War* 1.31-33; 7.421f.).

Mainstream Qumran-Essene Hypotheses

The establishment of some link between the movement responsible for the scrolls and the Essenes of the classical sources has a history as long as scrolls scholarship itself and in most circles is the closest thing to a consensus in the field.¹⁵ Various ‘Qumran-Essene’ hypotheses have been proposed; indeed a number of theories listed elsewhere in this present treatment (more readily characterised by other distinguishable features) contain an implied Essene identification. Of those to be considered here, the most celebrated is that as formulated chiefly by Geza Vermes, which argues firstly that the scrolls were written by an Essene group resident at Khirbet Qumran and secondly that ‘the Wicked Priest’ (for whom Vermes regards ‘the Man of the Lie’, ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ and ‘the Man of Scoffing’ to be alternative sobriquets) should be identified with Jonathan Maccabee (152-143 BCE).¹⁶ For ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’, no attempt at identification is made other than the argument that he was a priest and contemporary to Jonathan. With regard to other Qumran sobriquets however, Vermes argues that ‘the Lion of Wrath’ is the later figure of Alexander Jannaeus and that ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’ (which he equates with ‘Ephraim’; אפרים) are the Pharisees, thus rendering ‘Manasseh’ (מנשה) the Sadducees.

Variations of this Maccabaeian Qumran-Essene hypothesis abound. Frank Cross, for example, agrees with Vermes almost entirely, differing only in his identification of ‘the Wicked Priest’ with Simon Maccabee (143-135/4 BCE), whom he equates with the ‘cursed man’ of 4QTestimonia (4Q175 23).¹⁷ Jerome Murphy-O’Connor argues (on the basis of supposed historical information in the Damascus Document; e.g. CD 1.3 – 2.1; 6.2-11; 7.12-21) that the origins of the

¹⁵ This ‘consensus’ has increasingly come under fire in recent years (e.g. A.I. Baumgarten 2004) and some proponents have subsequently abandoned a straightforward equation of the two and adopted instead a more moderate position, accounting for points of difference as well as similarity. On ‘Revising the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis’, see Campbell 2002, pp.98-110. One of the most notable opposing identifications is that of Lawrence Schiffman, who argues that the scrolls are the product of a Sadducean or Sadducean-related group (1993; 1994, pp.83-95).

¹⁶ See primarily Vermes 2004 (pp.10-90, esp. pp.46-66), though also Vermes 1981.

¹⁷ Cross 1993; 1995, pp.54-120. Note also Nickelsburg 1976.

Essenes should be sought against the backdrop of the Babylonian exile, regarding 'Damascus' as a symbolic reference to Babylon.¹⁸ Allowing for differences between the Essenes as described in the classical sources and the movement responsible for the scrolls, he suggests that, rather than being identical, the latter were an offshoot of the former.¹⁹ Murphy-O'Connor agrees with Vermes' identification of 'the Wicked Priest' with Jonathan Maccabee and 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' with the Pharisees, and suggests further that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' was the acting High Priest during the 'intersacerdotium' (159-152 BCE).²⁰ However, unlike Vermes, he regards 'the Man of the Lie' to be a distinct figure from 'the Wicked Priest' and suggests that he should be identified with an authority within the larger Essene group (the rivalry between this figure and 'the Teacher of Righteousness' giving rise to the division within the movement; 1974, pp.233-238).

At odds with Murphy-O'Connor, Hartmut Stegemann argues that there was no internal split within the Essenes and that the movement as a whole was a mainstream 'Jewish Union' (including members of an earlier group, the 'New Covenant in the Land of Damascus', whose history is reflected in CD), centred in Jerusalem though with a library at Qumran.²¹ This movement, he claims, was led by 'the Teacher of Righteousness', whom he likewise identifies with the ousted High Priest of the 'intersacerdotium', thus rendering Jonathan Maccabee 'the Wicked Priest'. Stegemann, like Vermes, identifies 'the Lion of Wrath' with Alexander Jannaeus and 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' with the Pharisees, though he agrees with Murphy-O'Connor that 'the Man of the Lie' should be regarded a separate figure from 'the Wicked Priest' (1998, p.128).²²

¹⁸ Murphy-O'Connor 1971a; 1974 (pp.219-223); 1985.

¹⁹ Philip Davies has developed this hypothesis further, agreeing with it in essence but warning against Murphy-O'Connor's acceptance of CD as a largely Qumranic document and the dangers of taking too literally the apparent chronological and historical data of the texts (1983, pp.46-47; 1987, pp.33-49; 1990).

²⁰ Murphy-O'Connor 1974, pp.224-244

²¹ See primarily Stegemann 1992 (pp.138-166); cf. 1998 (pp.139-210).

²² A further variation on the above Qumran-Essene hypotheses is that of Gabriele Boccaccini (1998), who takes into account both Stegemann's suggestion that the Essenes proper were a

The Groningen Hypothesis

The so-called ‘Groningen hypothesis’ of Florentino García Martínez and Adam van der Woude is in many ways similar to a number of the Qumran-Essene hypotheses outlined above. Notably, it shares with Murphy-O’Connor (and Davies) the argument that those responsible for the scrolls represent a splinter-group from a wider Essene movement, though places the origin of this parent group in 3rd/2nd century BCE Palestine rather than the Babylonian exile.²³ However, with regard to our examination of the sobriquets, its most distinguishing feature is the contribution of van der Woude, who proposes:

to consider the designation “Wicked Priest” as a generic one referring to different Hasmonean High Priests in chronological order (García Martínez and van der Woude 1990, p.537).

Through close examination of 1QPesher on Habakkuk, focussing in particular on the various apparent fates of ‘the Wicked Priest’, van der Woude concludes that the sobriquet cannot possibly be applied to a single historical individual and that a plurality of figures must lie behind the epithet. To be precise, he identifies six successive ‘wicked priests’ in 1QpHab: Judas Maccabee (8.8-13), Alcimus (8.16 – 9.2), Jonathan (9.9-12), Simon (9.16 – 10.5), John Hyrcanus I (11.4-8) and Alexander Jannaeus (11.12 – 12.10).²⁴ ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ himself is not identified, though his death is dated to the reign of John Hyrcanus I (135/4-104 BCE), while ‘the Man of the Lie’, following Murphy-O’Connor, is assumed to be the leader of the wider Essene movement.

This approach is not unprecedented. William Brownlee also argued for a generic understanding of the sobriquet ‘the Wicked Priest’ on the basis of “the

mainstream Jewish movement and Murphy-O’Connor’s argument that the movement responsible for the scrolls was an Essene splinter group. He proposes that the latter split from the Essenes in the second century BCE and, highlighting the prominence of Enochic thought and literature among the scrolls, suggests that this wider Essene movement grew out of an Enochic form of Judaism. Cf. Boccaccini (ed.) 2005.

²³ García Martínez 1995a; 1996, pp.lii-liv; 1998a; García Martínez and van der Woude 1990, pp.536-541. Cf. Boccaccini (ed.) 2005, pp.247-326; Hempel 2005.

²⁴ See initially, van der Woude 1982. Also García Martínez and van der Woude 1990 (pp.536-541). Cf. Lim 1993a.

multiple dooms which befall him” (1982, p.4). He identified three ‘wicked priests’ in 1QPesher on Habakkuk: John Hyrcanus I, Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus. In addition, Brownlee argued that the sobriquets ‘the Man of the Lie’ and ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (as well as the ‘cursed man’ of 4QTestimonia) applied to the first of these ‘wicked priests’, John Hyrcanus I, while ‘the Lion of Wrath’ was an alternative title for the last, Alexander Jannaeus. Furthermore, ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’ were once again linked with the Pharisees, while ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ he identified as the known contemporary figure, Judah the Essene (1952; 1982).

1.2.2.2. The First Century BCE

Hasmonaean Hypotheses

A plural understanding of ‘the Wicked Priest’ was also an early proposal of André Dupont-Sommer, who at first identified two figures behind this sobriquet: Hyrcanus II (76-67, 63-40 BCE) and his brother Aristobulus II (67-63 BCE), the sons of Alexander Jannaeus.²⁵ However, he later revised his argument, identifying Hyrcanus II alone as ‘the Wicked Priest’ and rendering Alexander Jannaeus both ‘the Lion of Wrath’ and the ‘cursed man’ of 4QTestimonia (1961, pp.351-357). This latter theory has more recently been adopted and expanded upon by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg and Edward Cook in the introduction to their proffered translation of the scrolls (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996, pp.13-34). They too identify Hyrcanus II as ‘the Wicked Priest’, highlighting in support of a first century BCE context the names that appear in 4QHistorical Texts C-E (4Q331-33; see n.6 above).

According to Wise, Abegg and Cook, the movement responsible for the scrolls, who shared a Sadducean interpretation of many of the laws (a position they believe is evidenced in 4QMMT^{a-f} [4Q394-99]), were an integral part of Jewish society during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. The movement approved of the latter’s pro-Sadducean tendencies and, in particular, his anti-Pharisaic stance which appears to have led to the crucifixion of eight hundred Pharisees and

²⁵ Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.355, n.1.

the expulsion of many more (an event they believe is alluded to in 4Q169 frags 3-4, 1.1-8). Alexander Jannaeus is thus considered both ‘the Lion of Wrath’ and the ‘King Jonathan’ prayed for in 4Q448. With Hyrcanus II’s acquisition of the High Priesthood after Jannaeus’s death (76 BCE), the Pharisees once again rose to prominence; Wise, Abegg and Cook therefore identify the leader of the Pharisaic party at this time (Shimeon ben Shetah) as ‘the Man of the Lie’.²⁶

Hasmonaean-Jerusalem Hypotheses

In recent years, further variations of the above Hasmonaean hypotheses have been proposed, taking into account the first century BCE context implied in 4Q331-33 (as Wise, Abegg and Cook) coupled with the arguments of Norman Golb in favour of a Jerusalem origin for the scrolls. Golb, on the basis of observations such as the multiplicity of scribal hands, argues that the scrolls represent the contents of a Jerusalem library (or libraries), moved to the caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran (which he identifies as a fortress) at the time of the First Jewish Revolt (66-70 CE).²⁷ The two main proponents of a *Hasmonaean-Jerusalem* hypothesis, Ian Hutchesson and Greg Doudna, have thus incorporated various strands into their reconstructions.

Hutchesson argues firstly that the scrolls represent a disparate collection of texts originating in the Jerusalem temple, though, unlike Golb, he dates their “deposition” at Qumran to 63 BCE, shortly before Pompey’s siege of Jerusalem (Hutchesson 1999). He further posits that the texts were given to the Sadducees who, under Aristobulus II, controlled the various Hasmonaean fortresses including, according to Hutchesson, Khirbet Qumran. He stops short however of identifying the referents of any of the sobriquets. Doudna on the other hand, while agreeing with Hutchesson and Golb that the texts represent a Jerusalem library, argues that they were deposited at Qumran in 40 BCE, in the face of invasion by the Parthians (2001, pp.698-754; 2006). Furthermore, at odds with

²⁶ Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996, pp.26-34. So too Bruce 1956 (pp.94-95). Wise (2003) has more recently gone into greater detail on some of these identifications, highlighting his interpretation of apparent historical allusions in the sectarian texts.

²⁷ See primarily, Golb 1995 (also 1994).

Dupont-Sommer and Wise, Abegg and Cook, Doudna identifies Hyrcanus II not as ‘the Wicked Priest’ but as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (2001, pp.683-754). He thus renders Hyrcanus’ brother, Aristobulus II, ‘the Wicked Priest’, ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ and, intriguingly, ‘Manasseh’ (a sobriquet which Doudna argues should be taken in reference to a ruling individual), and further identifies Pompey as ‘the Lion of Wrath’ (2001, pp.627-674).²⁸

1.2.2.3. The First Century CE

Christian-Related Hypotheses

Several theories have tried to understand the scrolls and their sobriquets in the context of nascent Christianity. Though often meeting with limited support (especially in the light of evidence arising from the various dating techniques; see n.5 above) they are yet another example of the versatility with which the texts can be applied to a given historical scenario. Some are more unlikely than others. Barbara Thiering, for example, has proposed an unconvincingly detailed reconstruction in which she argues that ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ should be identified with John the Baptist, ‘the Lion of Wrath’ with Pontius Pilate, and ‘the Wicked Priest’ (and ‘the Man of the Lie’ / ‘the Man of Scoffing’) with Jesus of Nazareth, relocating the events of the gospels to Qumran.²⁹ Furthermore she identifies ‘Ephraim’ with the Therapeutae of Philo and ‘Manasseh’ with an order of celibate diaspora Essenes (1992, pp.71, 375).

Of the more reasonably argued proposals, Jacob Teicher (1954) likewise equated ‘the Wicked Priest’ with ‘the Man of the Lie’ but identified him with the

²⁸ Philip Davies has offered a response to these various Jerusalem hypotheses, evaluating the arguments of Golb, Hutchesson and Doudna and their implications for the viability of a Qumran-Essene hypothesis (Davies 2000a; cf. 1994, p.62). Denying that a Jerusalem origin and Essene authorship of the scrolls are mutually exclusive, Davies suggests the adoption of a “sound Essene hypothesis” (2000a, p.112) that regards the Essenes as a widespread movement (so Stegemann) centred in Jerusalem; a theory more compliant with Josephus’ presentation of the group as a major party (*War* 2.119-161; *Ant.* 13.171-173). He leaves open questions concerning a connection between the scrolls and the site of Khirbet Qumran (though suggests the latter may have been occupied by “sympathetic (even Essene?) inhabitants”; 2000a, p.112) and whether the scrolls were deposited in the first century BCE or first century CE. This ‘sound Essene hypothesis’, incorporating the insights of Golb, Hutchesson, Doudna, Stegemann and others, may provide a nuanced approach for future discussion.

²⁹ Thiering 1992.

apostle Paul, associating Jesus with ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ instead. More recently, Robert Eisenman has similarly regarded the apostle Paul as ‘the Man of the Lie’ (also ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ / ‘the Man of Scoffing’) but believes ‘the Wicked Priest’ to be a distinct figure. He identifies the latter as the High Priest Ananus and makes a case for identifying James the Just as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’, thus placing the scrolls in the context of both the internal and external disputes of the early Christian church.³⁰

The Zealot-Qumran Hypothesis

In 1958, shortly after the discovery of Cave 11, Cecil Roth proposed a hypothesis identifying the movement responsible for the scrolls with the Zealots as described in Josephus, set against the backdrop of the First Jewish Revolt (66-70 CE).³¹ The same premise was held and expanded upon by Godfrey Driver a few years later (Driver 1965). Highlighting the militant nature of the War Scroll (1QM; 4Q491-97), the presence of ‘the Kittim’ (הַכִּיטִּים; a foreign enemy whom Roth and Driver identified with the Romans) and the discovery of a copy of Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice at Masada (a text known otherwise only from Qumran; 4Q400-407; 11Q17), they concluded that, from the beginning of the first century CE, Qumran was a centre for the production of Zealot propaganda (having been abandoned by its previous inhabitants, perhaps the Essenes, in 31 BCE). Roth identified ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ with either the leader of the Zealots, Menahem ben Judah (d.66 CE) or his nephew, Eleazar ben Jair (d.73 CE), and ‘the Wicked Priest’ with the captain of the temple, Eleazar ben Hananiah.³² In addition, he suggested that ‘the House of Absalom’ (בֵּית אַבְשָׁלוֹם) was a reference to Menahem’s assistant, Absalom, who may have betrayed him (1958, pp.13-14).

Driver agreed with Roth’s identifications, arguing in greater depth for their veracity, and further deemed ‘the Man of the Lie’ (equated with ‘Ephraim’)

³⁰ Eisenman 1996, esp. pp.111-246, 332-351.

³¹ Roth 1958; cf. 1960; 1961.

³² Roth 1958, p.18.

to be John of Gischala, 'the Lion of Wrath' (equated with 'Manasseh') to be Simon bar Giora, and the 'cursed man' of 4QTestimonia to be their father (a man named Levi).³³ Though he does not identify him, Driver argued that 'the Spouter of the Lie' and 'the Man of Scoffing' should be regarded as sobriquets referring to the same unknown figure, adding, as with many other scholars, that 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' should be identified with the Pharisees (Driver 1965, pp.94, 309).

1.2.3. The Problems with a 'Naïve Historicism'

As can readily be seen from the overview above (which, it should be remembered, deals with only the broad contours of the differing hypotheses proposed for the origins of the scrolls), the sobriquets and apparent historical allusions in the texts are vague enough as to be applied with ease to various given historical scenarios. The plethora of information and range of possible interpretation ensures at least one or two points of overlap with numerous and varied historical contexts, on which the remainder of a hypothesis can be pinned. However, this versatility with which the texts can be applied is a warning in itself against what George Brooke terms a "naïve historicism":

namely that wherever there are two phenomena with even the vaguest correspondences they must be related in some way in terms of cause and effect. (Brooke 1994a, p.345)

There is thus an inherent danger with any approach that seeks to simply equate textual references with historical realia on the basis of one or two points of comparison; such an approach results from an overly-simplistic understanding of the nature of the texts themselves. With increasing frequency however, scholars are recognising some of the issues that impinge on any attempt to reconstruct history from texts and are incorporating this sensitivity into their readings and subsequent hypotheses.³⁴ There has therefore been a discernible move within

³³ Driver 1965, pp.284-298.

³⁴ See, for example, Berrin 2004a; 2004b; Brooke 1994a; Davies 1987; Grossman 2002; Metso 2004.

Qumran studies towards a more cautious approach, comparable to what John Barton and John Muddiman more generally term a ‘chastened’ historical criticism.³⁵

One immediate problem, as highlighted above (see n.9), is the questionable assumption that ‘historical’ works such as Josephus and the books of 1 and 2 Maccabees (taken in the majority of contextual hypotheses as a given against which the origins of the scrolls can be sought) contain an accurate account of events. The contradictions that abound not only between these sources but within Josephus’ own works prevent us from being able to take any of them as a wholly accurate historical account.³⁶ The approach therefore falls at the first hurdle; it could potentially be argued that there is no adequately defensible account of the period against which apparent allusions in the scrolls may be judged.

Similarly, even if texts such as the pesharim *are* primarily attempts to relate history (something that is itself by no means beyond question; cf. Jokiranta 2005a, pp.33-34), there is no reason to assume that such a historical account would be objective and/or accurate. Davies rightly points out that:

sects cannot be relied upon to give an authentic account of their own history! They tend to prefer stories in which they are the initiators rather than passive victims, and they will also retroject issues that may arise subsequently into the origin process itself. The only example that needs citing here is the New Testament itself. If Qumran scholarship relies entirely on a rather credulous reading of Qumran texts it will emerge with a sectarian history, not the history of a sect! (Davies 2005, p.81)³⁷

Furthermore, the development and redaction of these texts over time raises other issues about the integrity of any historical information contained therein, as noted by Sarianna Metso:

³⁵ Barton and Muddiman (eds) 2001, p.3. See also Jonathan Campbell’s introduction to the following volume: Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005 (pp.1-9).

³⁶ For example, as noted above (n.13), compare *Ant.* 12.387-388, 13.62-73 with *War* 1.31-33, 7.421f. Also 2 Macc. 4.7-10, 33-34 and *Ant.* 12.237-239.

³⁷ So too Jokiranta 2005a, pp.27, 29-30.

If the text passes through several editorial hands, the resulting text that we read may have been disconnected from its historical mooring and no longer reflect that history but a developed set of thoughts. (Metso 2004, p.334)

Indeed, the possibility remains that:

even in their original settings, these texts were perceived as ambiguous or potentially multivalent. (Grossman 2002, p.38)

Hence, a variety of obstacles prevent a straightforward reading of history out of these texts and raise questions about the kinds of sobriquet-identification attempted in the hypotheses outlined above. These problems are compounded when the texts are uncritically amalgamated in the assumption that they are complementary, so as to provide, for example, apparent biographical information about the referents of the sobriquets. Such an approach is, more often than not, unjustified and does not allow for the individuality (in terms of origin, genre, purpose, etc.) of each text. Any composite biographical picture derived from amalgamating texts in this way is likely therefore to be false or, at the very least, misleading.³⁸

The frequently occurring use of scripture, either explicitly or implicitly, in those texts most often deemed to be of some historical value (e.g. the Damascus Document, the pesharim, etc.), serves as yet another warning against a straightforward reading of history out of them. Various studies have demonstrated the complexity of this relationship between sectarian text and scriptural base text or secondary scriptural sources, most concluding that surprisingly little of what *appears* to be innovative in these texts is in fact unmotivated by or independent of an underlying scriptural allusion.³⁹ As Brooke notes with regard to the pesharim:

³⁸ This leads Davies to argue that, with regard to the pesharim at least, “we have no warrant to plunder them for historical data” (1987, p.27).

³⁹ With regard to the Damascus Document, see primarily Campbell 1995a. On the pesharim, see for example: Berrin 2000a; 2004a; Jokiranta 2005a. For an extensive list of ‘Quotations and Allusions in the Nonbiblical Scrolls’, see VanderKam and Flint 2002 (pp.427-433).

When the scriptural citation is properly put first in our consideration of these texts, it immediately becomes apparent how much it determines the way the commentary runs. This in itself explains why the language of the interpretation in the pesher proper remains so stereotypical and why its possible historical referents continue to defy identification and *will continue to do so*. (Brooke 1994a, p.340)

This issue is further exacerbated by the possibility that, in addition to scriptural influence, apparent historical information might be dependent upon other, presumably earlier, sectarian texts. For example, citing both explicit and implicit connections between the two, Davies has famously suggested that, with regard to information concerning the career of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ for example, the pesharim might be dependent upon the Hodayot (1QH^a; 1Q35; 4Q427-32), a question we shall return to below.⁴⁰ In her recent analysis of the Damascus Document, Maxine Grossman has similarly speculated about its literary relationship with 1QPesher on Habakkuk, suggesting that:

the Habakkuk pesher may be understood as an outgrowth of and response to the tradition surrounding the Damascus Document. ... In this sense, the ‘history’ provided in the Habakkuk pesher itself may be a creative rereading of the Damascus Document. It offers no historical information but merely attempts to narrate, retrospectively, an account of the community’s origins, based on a shared communal tradition, but not an outside source of confirmatory evidence. (Grossman 2002, pp.156-157)⁴¹

Suggestions such as these, coupled with the other problems outlined above, lead us to conclude that the extraction of historical information from these texts is not only fraught with difficulty but could well prove to be little short of impossible. In this light, any attempt to actually identify the referents of the sobriquets could be construed as all but doomed from the outset. That said, it may be that there is yet some hope for such an endeavour but only if approached in a manner sensitive to the various criticisms levelled at the ‘naïve historicism’ of the past. For the purposes of this thesis however, we shall refrain from seeking to identify the referents of the sobriquets, acknowledging the many obstacles to such a goal.⁴²

⁴⁰ Davies 1987, pp.87-105.

⁴¹ Also Brooke 1991a, p.229.

⁴² Cf. Callaway 1990, p.639.

Instead we shall continue by examining what can be said about the sobriquets on their own terms as labels within the sectarian literature.

1.3. Re-evaluating the Use of Sobriquets in the Scrolls

1.3.1. The Nature and Function of the Qumran Sobriquets

A sobriquet, loosely defined, is a nickname. As with all nicknames, the individual or group referred to is not necessarily aware of its existence but it serves as an alternative, and perhaps more appropriate, designation in the eyes of those who use it. Preference for its use might be heightened by the descriptive element it often includes.⁴³ More precisely therefore, a sobriquet is a label that can convey positive or negative connotations and which, given the subjective nature of the descriptive element, has validity only within the context of those who share such a viewpoint.⁴⁴ Its meaning and specific referent may well be clear to those ‘in the know’ yet perpetually obscure to outsiders. In this sense, a sobriquet is not strictly a codename (though it may seem it to outsiders), but a transparent label obvious to those among whom it is used.⁴⁵

Among the scrolls, sobriquets appear chiefly in such sectarian texts as the Damascus Document, the Hodayot and the various pesharim. They include the following:⁴⁶

מורה הצדק	-	The Teacher of Righteousness
מורה היחיד	-	The Teacher of the Community
דורש התורה	-	The Seeker of the Law

⁴³ On the “striking similarity between the Qumranic sobriquets and the social phenomenon behind nicknaming”, see Bengtsson 2000a, pp.37-39. Also, Fröhlich 2004.

⁴⁴ A figure labelled ‘the Wicked Priest’ (הכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע), for example, may not agree with such a description or recognise it as valid (see Bengtsson 2000b, pp.247-248).

⁴⁵ So also Håkan Bengtsson who, in his examination of sobriquets in the pesharim, concludes that the “assumption of secret codes is really unnecessary” (2000a, p.282; see further pp.3-7, 281-282). Similarly, Jokiranta 2005a (pp.27-28). Cf. Callaway 1988, pp.135-136.

⁴⁶ For a more extensive list, see Bengtsson 2000a (pp.8-11), 2000b (p.243) or Callaway 1988 (p.135).

עושי התורה	-	The Doers of the Law
מטיף הכזב	-	The Spouter of the Lie
איש הכזב	-	The Man of the Lie
איש הלצון	-	The Man of Scoffing
הכוהן הרשע	-	The Wicked Priest
דורשי החלקות	-	The Seekers of Smooth Things

It should be noted that the precise form of each of these designations can vary from text to text (or even within a text). However, those listed here can be described as 'standard' forms, found most frequently among the scrolls themselves and/or cited most commonly in the secondary literature. Alternative forms, such as indefinite designations (e.g. מורה צדק), are also attested though commonly regarded as variants of no real consequence.⁴⁷

Attempts have been made to categorise the different Qumran sobriquets, though the approach is problematic. Håkan Bengtsson, for example, identifies two essential types: 'circumstantially constructed sobriquets' and 'biblically adopted sobriquets' (2000a, pp.30-37). The first he regards as innovative constructions of the Yahad (though with evaluative features drawn from scriptural material), formed from the conjunction of a noun or participle with an adjective or *nomen rectum*, such as: מורה הצדק; הכוהן הרשע; איש הכזב; דורשי החלקות. Bengtsson's second category refers to those designations ostensibly adopted from scriptural texts (some also in the construct state), such as: מנשה; אפרים; בית אבשלום; בית יהודה; הכתיאים.⁴⁸ The distinction between these two is not clear-cut however as *both* draw similarly upon scriptural typologies.⁴⁹ The degree to which this can be regarded as explicit or implicit

⁴⁷ E.g. Lim 2002, p.75.

⁴⁸ The examples here are Bengtsson's own (2000a, p.30).

⁴⁹ For example, דורשי החלקות might arguably be placed in the second category (cf. Isaiah 30.10) while a case could be made for placing בית אבשלום in the first.

implies a subjectivism that is unhelpful as a means of distinction between these two supposed groups.

Ida Fröhlich likewise distinguishes between ‘symbolic names’ (based on the characteristics of the referent; e.g. **הכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע**; **מִוְרָה הַצַּדִּיק**) and ‘typological names’ (those utilising scriptural typologies to perform an evaluative function; e.g. **בֵּית אֲבִשְׁלוֹם**; **הַכְּתִיאִים**), comparable with Bengtsson’s ‘circumstantially constructed’ and ‘biblically adopted’ categories.⁵⁰ However, more recently she has demonstrated an awareness of the problematic nature of this division:

after a thorough analysis of the biblical background of some names it became obvious to me that certain names I called first symbolic, are nearer to the category of typological names, because they are rather based on some biblical expression or poetic image than the attributes of a real character. The biblical background is often not apparent at first approach. (Fröhlich 2004, p.2)

Thus, while not always readily apparent, we should nevertheless not underestimate the role of scripture in the use and construction of the Qumran sobriquets. Accordingly, attempts to categorise the designations by reference to the degree to which this is explicit are unhelpful.

Other approaches have been made. Fröhlich elsewhere groups various epithets in relation to, for example, ‘social terms’ (e.g. ‘authority’; ‘special religious practice and knowledge’).⁵¹ Alternatively, Bengtsson suggests a division with regard to implied referent, listing the following six groups:⁵²

1. Designations of enemies

- a) Singular persons (e.g. **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע**)
- b) Groups (e.g. **דִּוְרֵשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת**)

⁵⁰ Fröhlich 1996, pp.160-161; 2004, p.2. A further category of ‘associative/topical names’ is also highlighted, those suggested by the scriptural text under consideration (e.g. **כַּפִּיר הַחֲרוֹן** in 4Q169 frags 3-4, 1.4-8; cf. Nahum 2.12-13).

⁵¹ Fröhlich 1999.

⁵² Bengtsson 2000a, pp.7-11.

2. Honorary designations

- a) Singular persons (e.g. מורה הצדק)
- b) Groups (e.g. עושי התורה)

3. Designations of rulers

- a) Singular persons (e.g. כפיר החרון)
- b) Groups (e.g. הכתאים)

However, such a schema makes an explicit historical assumption in as much as it regards from the outset certain of the sobriquets to refer to ‘rulers’. The same criticism holds true for Bengtsson’s four-way categorisation employed elsewhere, in which he lists the sobriquets as: ‘individual personal’, ‘individual impersonal’, ‘collective specific’ and ‘collective unspecific’ (2000b, pp.243-245). It is his assumption that הכתאים should be identified with the Romans or Seleucids that renders it a ‘collective *specific* sobriquet’ as opposed to ‘collective unspecific’ (e.g. the unidentified הבגדים).

Aside from matters of referent or scriptural dependence, both Bengtsson and Fröhlich recognise the intrinsic *evaluative* nature of the designations (Bengtsson 2000a, pp.30-39, 49-50; Fröhlich 1999; 2004). Whether explicitly or implicitly the sobriquets perform an evaluative function (confirmation of which can often be found in the surrounding context), in that each “conveys correctly the author’s estimate of the characters concerned” (Harris 1966, pp.53-54). For example, Bengtsson’s so-called ‘circumstantially constructed sobriquets’ (Fröhlich’s ‘symbolic names’) are for the most part explicitly evaluative; they reveal something of the character of the person or group labelled. ‘The Wicked Priest’ is first and foremost a priest, but furthermore one deemed to be ‘wicked’ by those doing the labelling; the sobriquet itself performs judgement on the character. There can be no doubt on the other hand that ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ is approved of. The specific construction of these sobriquets may also carry additional layers of meaning. For instance, it has been noted that הכוהן הרשע (‘the Wicked Priest’) may be a pun on הכוהן הראש (‘the High

Priest'), further emphasising the character's shortfall in the eyes of those doing the labelling.⁵³

In contrast, Bengtsson's supposed 'biblically adopted sobriquets' (Fröhlich's 'typological names') are largely *implicitly* evaluative. Utilising scriptural texts as 'character types' they are applied so as to demonstrate the nature of the individual or group labelled. Comment is therefore made by association rather than accusation, and requires a greater degree of prior knowledge for the connotations implied to be understood. However, given the prominence of scripture within the social context in which these sobriquets arose, this is not to suggest any deliberate secrecy or code. In fact, quite the opposite is true. As Bengtsson points out, the clarity with which the evaluative nature of the sobriquets is established (whether, in his opinion, 'circumstantially constructed' or 'biblically adopted') suggests that, far from being codenames, these sobriquets were transparent labels which served to "corroborate the message" (2000a, p.37) conveyed in the texts. Thus, given the problematic nature of the categorical distinctions outlined above, it may be preferable for our purposes (highlighting this evaluative function) to speak instead simply of 'positive' and 'negative' sobriquets, both categories containing labels applicable to individuals and labels applicable to groups.⁵⁴

Bengtsson identifies three levels of meaning with regard to the function of the sobriquets: the textual, the symbolic and the historical (2000b, pp.248-249). Hence each sobriquet is simultaneously a textual expression, an evaluation and a historical reference. It is however the evaluative function that appears to take precedence:

⁵³ Brownlee 1979, p.49; 1982, p.9; VanderKam 1999a, p.528. We may recognise a similar phenomenon with regard to the later figure Simeon bar Kosiba, punned both positively as 'bar Kokhba' and negatively as 'bar Koziba' (Bengtsson 2000b, p.246; Campbell 2002, p.192, n.52; Vermes 1975, p.48; 2001, p.112; cf. Zeitlin 1952). See Radday 1990 (esp. pp.59-60, 65-66).

⁵⁴ We shall for the most part further reserve the term 'sobriquet' for those labels which appear specifically appellative (i.e. performing a titular, rather than merely descriptive, function). This may be indicated by form (e.g. use of the definite article) or context (e.g. consistent use of a designation to indicate an individual or group for whom there is a reluctance to provide any other concrete appellation). We shall similarly reserve the use of capital letters for rendering these titular designations.

Even if the epithets originated in an historical situation, their primary function is to evaluate different characters and groups. (Bengtsson 2000a, p.ii)

Given this role, the transparent nature of the labels to those ‘in the know’ and the fact that the sobriquets have validity only within the context of those who share such a viewpoint, it is increasingly apparent that they were intended for internal use rather than direct confrontation. In this manner they constitute an “insider terminology” (Bengtsson 2000a, p.39), commenting upon individuals and groups by means of evaluative labels and demonstrating in no uncertain terms the position taken with respect to them by those doing the labelling.

1.3.2. The Origins of the Qumran Sobriquets

The influence of scriptural texts upon the construction and application of the Qumran sobriquets cannot be overemphasised (Fröhlich 1999, pp.299-305).⁵⁵ Nevertheless, the experiences and writings of the movement itself must be recognised as a source of inspiration. As mentioned above, Davies has argued convincingly that historical information in the pesharim (in particular that relating to the career of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’) might be dependent upon the Hodayot (Davies 1987, pp.87-105). He posits firstly that, as often the case with modern scholars:

within the Qumran community these hymns – and at the very least the autobiographical ones – were understood to be compositions of the “Teacher”. Hence, they comprised a sort of hagiography; they enshrined what were seen as the most authentic data about the life and experiences of the founder of the community that could possibly exist. (Davies 1987, pp.89-90)⁵⁶

Subsequently, Davies argues that a great deal of supposed ‘historical information’ in the pesharim (that which is “not derivable from the [biblical] text but seems

⁵⁵ E.g. מורה הצדק (cf. Hosea 10.12; Joel 2.23?); מטף הכזב (Micah 2.11?); דורשי החלקות (Isaiah 30.10?).

⁵⁶ Ever since their discovery, the Hodayot (or portions thereof) have frequently been attributed to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (e.g. Sukenik (ed.) 1955, p.39); see further our discussion in Chapter Three. It should be noted that Michael Knibb disagrees with Davies’ suggestion (Knibb 1990, p.54).

gratuitous"; 1987, p.92), can in fact be derived instead from the Hodayot.⁵⁷ This indicates the distinct possibility that the scriptural lemma of the pesharim was taken in conjunction with the Hodayot in order to (re)construct the life of 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the pesharim. Hence:

the pesharim phenomenon at Qumran may well be a development late in the history of the community and have little to do with the activities of the "Teacher". Certainly, it may have little to do with real history. (Davies 1987, p.104)

As already observed, Grossman similarly casts doubt upon our ability to extract historical information from the pesharim, arguing that the Damascus Document may also have influenced their content:

the historical claims of the Damascus Document – whether accurate or not – may have served as the inspiration for the creativity of the pesharim's author/editor(s), who chose to clarify and expand upon an account that was presented only tangentially in the earlier Damascus Document, but which was understood as important in a larger communally-shared interpretive and historical tradition. (Grossman 2002, pp.156-157)

Likewise Brooke:

The pesharim may thus be better understood as an attempt to rewrite the actual history of the Qumran community in terms of the fulfilment of prophetic texts read from within the tradition represented by such texts as the *Damascus Document* (Brooke 1991a, p.229).

Such arguments not only advise caution for attempts to identify the referents of the sobriquets, but also, in suggesting the dependence of some sectarian texts upon others (in this case the various pesharim upon the Hodayot and/or the Damascus Document), may provide us with an approach for better understanding the sobriquets themselves.

We have noted that, in addition to the 'standard' form found most frequently among the scrolls themselves and/or cited most commonly in the secondary literature (usually attesting the definite article and performing an apparent titular function), many of the Qumran sobriquets appear in variant

⁵⁷ This is demonstrated by comparison of 1QpHab 11.2-8 with 1QH^a 12.6-12 (Davies 1987, pp.93-96; cf. Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002, p.95).

related forms throughout the texts. The accusation of 'seeking smooth things', for example, appears variously as:

1. דורשי החלקות (4Q163 frag.23, 2.10; 4Q169 frags 3-4, 1.2; 1.7; 2.2; 2.4; 3.3; 3.6-7; 4Q177 2.12).
2. דורשי חלקות (1QH^a 10.15; 10.32).⁵⁸
3. דרשו בחלקות (CD 1.18; 4Q266 frag.2, 1.21).

Similarly, the 'teaching of righteousness' can be found in the following forms:

1. מורה הצדק (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 6; 4Q173 frag.1, 4).⁵⁹
2. מורה יצדקה (1QpHab 2.2).
3. מורה צדק (CD 1.11; 20.32).
4. יורה הצדק (CD 6.11).⁶⁰

If some sectarian texts are indeed dependent upon others (particularly with regard to supposed historical information), might such varying forms bear witness not to a certain looseness of usage but to the *development over time* of the Qumran sobriquets? Consequently, in addition to scriptural texts, might earlier *sectarian*

⁵⁸ Note also חלקות (1QH^a 12.10; cf. 4Q184 frag.1, 17; 4Q185 frags 1-2, 2.14) and the verbal form החליקו (1QH^a 12.7).

⁵⁹ Perhaps also to be restored with regard to the possible partial attestations at: 4Q163 frag.21, 6; 4Q171 3.15; 3.19; 4.27; 4Q172 frag.7, 1; 4Q173 frag.2, 2; 4Q253a frag.1, 1.5. The reconstruction of מורה הצדק has also been suggested by some scholars at 1Q14 frag.11, 4 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 4Q165 frags 1-2, 3 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) and 4Q171 4.8 (Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); these are highly speculative however.

⁶⁰ The following designations might also bear some relation to the sobriquet 'the Teacher of Righteousness': מורה היחיד (CD 20.1); יורה היחיד (CD 20.14); מורה (CD 20.28); משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3).

texts have likewise influenced the specific construction and application of later sobriquets, indicative of an evolving sectarian context?⁶¹

Bengtsson makes a similar suggestion, taking the findings of Davies, Grossman and Brooke a step further by claiming:

Thus, some passages in Damascus Document should be acknowledged as influential on the design and formation of some *sobriquets* in the pesharim. The formation of “the Teacher of Righteousness”, “the Seekers of Smooth Things”, “the Man of the Lie”, “Ephraim” and “Peleg” has very likely been influenced by the Damascus Document, and in some respects the Hodayoth. (Bengtsson 2000a, p.290; my italics)

This is also supported by Ida Fröhlich’s examination of ‘Qumran names’, where she suggests that “antecedent forms” of the sobriquets might be found in texts such as the Damascus Document (1999, pp.299-300, n.33). In fact, in the latter half of his chapter on ‘History and Hagiography’, Davies too, noting a discernible general shift from plural designations in the Hodayot to singular ones in the pesharim, tentatively ventures the suggestion that the sobriquets as they appear in the commentaries have been influenced by earlier sectarian texts (Davies 1987, pp.97-105).

Leaving aside temporarily the specific views of these scholars regarding the relative dating of such texts as the Damascus Document, the Hodayot and the various pesharim, let us examine the assumption that evidence of sobriquet development might be contained in these texts. As observed above, most hypotheses place supposed events concerning ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’, ‘the Wicked Priest’ and others, in the second or first centuries BCE, *yet assume that the scrolls were abandoned in 68 CE.*⁶² These suppose therefore a movement spanning several generations and lasting perhaps some two hundred years or more. The wealth of texts considered ‘sectarian’ and the evidence for revision and redaction (for example, multiple attestations of so-called ‘D’ and ‘S’ [‘Damascus’ and ‘Serekh’] material) prohibits us from understanding their production as a

⁶¹ As William Schniedewind observes: “Khirbet Qumran existed for at least two hundred years. It must be assumed that the language of the community evolved over that period” (1999a, p.237). So too, Fröhlich 1999 (pp.294-295).

⁶² The Hasmonaean-Jerusalem hypotheses of Doudna (2001; 2006) and Hutchesson (1999) would be obvious exceptions to this.

singular, simultaneous event. In other words, these texts were composed, copied and redacted over an unspecified period of time (Dimant 2000). The variety of dates produced by palaeography and AMS, despite criticisms of the accuracy of these procedures, likewise supports this suggestion.⁶³

A movement with a history of some two hundred years, no matter how conservative in outlook, is likely to have undergone subtle changes and development in both ideology and standpoint (see Fröhlich 1999, pp.294-295; Lim 2002, p.11). García Martínez, for example, highlights the “evolutionary character of thought” and “non-static vision” reflected in key sectarian texts (1995a, p.86). In particular we might anticipate that a reactionary group, such as the Qumran-related movement is often assumed to be, would respond in some way to the changing political situation over such an extended period. Again, the multiple (differing) attestations of various sectarian texts inform us that such changes and developments did indeed take place.⁶⁴ Sarianna Metso states that furthermore:

Methodologically, we should keep the option open that complex developments were likely to have been in place even in those parts of the Qumran library for which physical evidence attesting to these developments is no longer preserved. (Metso 2004, p.330)

Even assuming a ‘single-generation’ hypothesis, the evidence of such development (though forced into a shorter timescale) is undeniable. Indeed, from this perspective, hypotheses regarding the scrolls as the product of a disparate (rather than homogeneous) Jerusalem library (e.g. Golb 1995) are forced, on the grounds of evident redaction and similarity of terminology, to regard ‘groups’ of texts at least as having undergone such development.

The very existence of apparent ‘standard’ forms of the sobriquets, used across a number of texts (see for example the numerous occurrences of **דורשי** **החלקות** or **מורה הצדק** listed above), implies a process of some description by

⁶³ See for example, Carmi 2000.

⁶⁴ Compare for example 1QS 5.1-3 and 4Q258 1.2-3 (cf. Campbell 2002, pp.80-81; Davies 1994, pp.63-68). See further, Davies 1992 (cf. 1996, pp.151-161); Metso 1997; 2000a; 2004.

which this standardisation was achieved. It appears reasonable therefore, given changes over time and the potential dependence of some sectarian texts upon others, to admit the possibility that 'non-standard' forms might, rather than variants, represent earlier (or at least, other) stages of sobriquet development. Such a possibility at the very least warrants further investigation.

1.3.3. Hypothesis and Method

This thesis, as stated, constitutes an examination of key sobriquets found among the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls. More specifically however, it hypothesises that, given the traditionally allotted time-span for sectarian composition and evidence for ideological development attested by the texts, the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process, changing in form and perhaps meaning and/or referent. It further speculates that this process might be evidenced within the scrolls themselves if examined in a manner sensitive to the varied composition dates of the texts and with particular reference to the precise forms taken by the sobriquets where they appear. The specific question under consideration therefore, is whether convincing evidence of such development can indeed be found in the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls.

In terms of method, this investigation necessitates in the first instance an agreed chronological schema for ordering the key texts to be examined. In the absence of consensus among scholars on this point, in the remainder of this chapter various proposals will be highlighted and a particular reconstruction adopted for the purposes of this thesis. Having established a schema and thus divided the relevant texts into 'sectarian layers', these will be examined in subsequent chapters according to their groups. Note will be taken of the precise form and context of any relevant sobriquet occurrence, as well as instances of related terminology where appropriate. In this manner it is to be hoped that it will be possible to identify any trends or practices that may appear with regard to the (differing?) use and/or formation of sobriquets within or between these chronological groups.

Lack of available space prohibits a thorough investigation of *all* the sobriquets and hence this thesis will focus chiefly upon the interplay between a significant oppositional pair. Not surprisingly, one of these is ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה הצדק). The other, contrary perhaps to expectation, is ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (מטף הכזב). Despite the scholarly attention lavished upon ‘the Wicked Priest’, this sobriquet appears only in the pesharim (and always in the form הכוהן הרשע; 1QpHab 8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2; 12.8; 4Q171 4.8).⁶⁵ It is entirely absent from other key texts concerning opposition to the ‘teacher’, such as the Damascus Document and (perhaps) the Hodayot.⁶⁶ Instead it is the various ‘liar’-associated sobriquets (‘the Man of the Lie’; ‘the Spouter of the Lie’; ‘the Man of Scoffing’), and related designations, that occur with the greatest frequency in this role.

It has been suggested that מטף הכזב and איש הכזב (and perhaps איש הלצון) refer to the same historical figure.⁶⁷ The historical question aside, the similarity between the labels certainly suggests the possibility of some relation with regard to origin or function and therefore requires an examination that encompasses both designations (just as our examination of מורה הצדק will include consideration of epithets such as מורה היחיד). Nevertheless, in terms of these sobriquets themselves, the greatest parallel is between מורה הצדק and מטף הכזב. Here, as shall be examined in greater depth in subsequent chapters, we are presented with two pairs of corresponding root forms: נטף and ירה (both

⁶⁵ It has been suggested that הכוהן הרשע be reconstructed in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.13 (e.g. Brownlee 1979; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Lohse 1981; Vermes 2004), though this is contested by Timothy Lim (2000a; 2002, pp.33-36). Note also הכוהן (1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12). Furthermore, Allegro (1968) read [הכ]והן הרשע in 4Q163 frag.30, 3 (cf. Abegg, Bowley and Cook 2003; Allegro *et al.* 2004a; Bengtsson 2000a, p.51), though this is not acknowledged by Lim (2000b; 2002, p.70) who lists the sobriquet as occurring only in 1QpHab and 4Q171. In either case, הכוהן הרשע is exclusive to the pesharim.

⁶⁶ The extent to which we may regard the Hodayot as concerning opposition to the ‘teacher’ is largely dependent upon the question of (implied) authorship, to which we shall return in Chapter Three.

⁶⁷ See primarily the discussion in Bengtsson 2000a (pp.88-94).

indicative of a didactic role, with positive and negative connotations respectively and a shared underlying metaphorical use of water imagery) and כֹּזֵב and צַדִּיק (the polarised qualification of these two functions).⁶⁸ Both sobriquets refer to teachers, though while one is associated with righteousness the other is characterised by lies. In terms of role therefore, ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (as a label denoting a ‘false preacher’) constitutes the perfect foil to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’.⁶⁹

For the purposes of this investigation then, we shall effectively be focussing our examination upon the development and employment of the oppositional sobriquets מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב and מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק, along with related designations where appropriate. The conclusions thus drawn will be further demonstrated by use of a supplementary case study involving the group sobriquet ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’ (דוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת), itself the subject of intense speculation in numerous historical reconstructions.⁷⁰ The results obtained with regard to the possible development of these labels will be compared with insights garnered from a sociological approach (specifically one drawing upon the sociology of deviance and ‘labelling theory’) in order to investigate the compliance of this thesis’ findings with research carried out in another academic field. In return, these sociological insights may shed further light upon the nature of our results.

1.4. Chronologically Ordering the Key Texts

1.4.1. Texts under Consideration

Before listing the texts to be considered for investigation, it would be helpful to note the various occurrences of forms related to the sobriquet ‘the

⁶⁸ See: Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Davidson 2002; Holladay 2000; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995; 1996.

⁶⁹ Bengtsson too notes this “striking” parallel (2000a, p.288) and further addresses the unjustified weighting often given to ‘the Wicked Priest’ in historical reconstructions (pp.290-292).

⁷⁰ See for example the varied hypotheses outlined above. Also, Bengtsson 2000a, pp.110-135.

Spouter of the Lie', as indeed we have already done for 'the Teacher of Righteousness' above. The accusation of 'spouting lies' appears variously as:

1. מטִיף הכּוֹז (1QpHab 10.9; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 4).⁷¹
2. מטִיף כּוֹז (CD 8.13).
3. הטיף לישראל מימי כּוֹז (CD 1.14-15).
4. מטִיף אדם לכּוֹז (CD 19.25-26).⁷²

So armed, having now compiled a (preliminary) list of references for the sobriquets 'the Teacher of Righteousness', 'the Spouter of the Lie' and (pre-empting our discussion in Chapter Five) 'the Seekers of Smooth Things', we are in a position to clearly identify those texts which will be at the core of this examination:⁷³

CD		[Qimron 1992a]
1QH ^a		[Sukenik (ed.) 1955; plates 35-58]
1QpHab		[Burrows (ed.) 1950; plates 55-61]
1QpMic	(1Q14)	[Milik 1955; plate 15]
4Qpap pIsa ^c	(4Q163)	[Allegro 1968; plates 7-8]
4QpNah	(4Q169)	[Allegro 1968; plates 12-14]

⁷¹ Perhaps also to be restored at 1QpHab 10.17 – 11.1 (e.g. Horgan 1979). We might further speculate that מטִיף הכּוֹז may at one time have appeared in the pesher following Isaiah 9.13-16 in 4Q163 frags 4-6, 1.6-10 and following the citation of Micah 2.10-11 in 4Q177 1.6-10, both providing a suitable terminological context for the epithet.

⁷² The following designations might also bear some relation to the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie': מטִיף (CD 4.19); איש הכּוֹז (CD 20.15; 1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11; 4Q171 1.26; 4.14); מליצי (1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10); נביאי כּוֹז (1QH^a 12.16; 4Q430 frag.1, 4). Furthermore, Lim makes the tentative suggestion that [מִיָּיִ] (sic) be restored at 1QpHab 9.16 (1993a, p.422).

⁷³ Square brackets here indicate the location of photographic plates of these manuscripts. Further bibliographical information will appear where appropriate in subsequent chapters. The following texts, which may contain related terminology (see n.58 and n.59 above) but which are either too fragmentary to offer a significant contribution or utilise this terminology in a contextually distinct manner, will not form part of our overall survey but will be discussed where appropriate: 4Q165 [Allegro 1968; plate 9]; 4Q184 [Allegro 1968; plate 28]; 4Q185 [Allegro 1968; plates 29-30]; 4Q253a [Brooke 1996; plate 14].

4QpPs ^a	(4Q171)	[Allegro 1968; plates 14-17]
4QpUnid	(4Q172)	[Allegro 1968; plate 18]
4QpPs ^b	(4Q173)	[Allegro 1968; plate 18]
4QCatena A	(4Q177)	[Allegro 1968; plates 24-25]
4QCommGen A	(4Q252)	[Brooke 1996; plates 12-13]
4QD ^a	(4Q266)	[J.M. Baumgarten 1996; plates 1-17]
4QH ^d	(4Q430)	[Schuller 1999; plate 12]

1.4.2. The Problems with a Chronological Schema

Before attempting to line these texts up in some sort of chronological order, it would be prudent to examine the various problems inherent to such an approach. One that is immediately apparent is the lack of consensus among scholars regarding the relative composition dates of these texts (see Steudel 2000, p.336). For example, the Damascus Document is variously presented as either for the most part one of the very *earliest* Qumran-related compositions (with quite possibly an antecedent history stretching back further still) or as one of the very *latest* compositions (appearing some time after other major sectarian works).⁷⁴ In these instances, dating techniques such as palaeography and AMS are of limited value. Firstly, serious questions have been raised about the accuracy of these techniques and the results are consequently often subject to interpretation.⁷⁵ Palaeography in particular has been accused of inherent subjectivism and of being grounded in suppositions that cannot necessarily be verified (e.g. a common (Qumran) origin for all the texts and a steady generational rate of change with regard to style).⁷⁶ Secondly, these techniques date only the extant manuscript (in fact, in the case of AMS, only the material the text is written on) and therefore provide merely a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the text.

⁷⁴ For the former position, see for example Davies (1983) and Hempel (1999a). For the latter, see Stegemann (1998, pp.116-118) and Thiering (2000).

⁷⁵ Cf. Atwill and Braunheim with Eisenman 2004; Callaway 1994; Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002, pp.68-75; Doudna 1998; Golb 1995, pp.249-272.

⁷⁶ See Wise 2003, pp.55-62.

A further problem is posed by the existence of multiple recensions of texts.⁷⁷ These preserve different versions or editions and imply a redactional history lying behind the composition. In such cases it becomes hard, if not impossible, to speak of a ‘definitive’ or ‘original’ text and we are forced instead to speak of developing traditions and themes. Consequently, varied recensions of texts have, quite naturally, differing ‘composition’ dates, inasmuch as each recension might essentially be regarded a new composition. This problem is even apparent *within* given texts; it is often possible to recognise evidence of redaction in a single manuscript.⁷⁸ In terms of identifying the relative composition dates of specific texts, this redactional process (of unspecified length) can easily heighten confusion as composition is evidently ongoing.

Davies notes that this problem is compounded by the fact that:

texts continue to exist side by side and can influence each other during their transmission history...⁷⁹

In other words, the redactional process is not necessarily limited (or internal) to one body of tradition; varying recensions of one composition might be influenced by those of another, thus creating intrinsic ties between texts that further complicate the issue. On the other hand, if the scrolls represent a disparate (possibly Jerusalem) collection (so Golb and Hutchesson) we are perhaps unable to speak of such influence at all and questions are therefore raised about the viability of seeking relative compositional dates.

On this last point, an overview of the content of the collection reveals it to be “surprisingly homogeneous” (van der Woude 1998, p.3).⁸⁰ Emanuel Tov has further noted a degree of homogeneity with regard to scribal practices across the scrolls, concluding that:

⁷⁷ See, for example, n.64 above. In particular, see Davies 1992 (cf. 1996, pp.151-161); 1994.

⁷⁸ Even prior to the release of the 4QD material, Davies argued that there was clear evidence of redaction in CD-A (1983). In particular he argued that much of the first column was a later gloss, post-dating the arrival of a historical ‘teacher’.

⁷⁹ Kindly pointed out in personal correspondence of 22 July 2005.

⁸⁰ Also Dimant 2000, p.171.

The data analysed here point to the existence of a Qumran scribal school which penned almost all the works often described as “sectarian,” and in addition sundry texts, among them several biblical texts. (Tov 2000, p.216)

This does not deny a Jerusalem origin for some or indeed all of the scrolls, but does imply that the collection should be regarded as congruent rather than disparate.⁸¹ Similarity of content, terminology and scribal practice, coupled with the evidence for the apparent dependence of some texts upon others and an inter-textual redactional history, seems to point inexorably to this conclusion.

That aside, how are we to proceed in terms of establishing a chronological schema? For our purposes we need not assign specific dates to texts, merely order them relative to each other. The evidence however is not such that we can be so specific with regard to each of the thirteen individual texts listed above. Though warning of the dangers of a rigid chronology, Davies does concede that:

to some extent obviously literary dependence has chronological implications.⁸²

Perhaps then we are best to avoid detailed chronological specifications and instead speak in broad terms of bodies of tradition or blocks of material against a backdrop of distinct sectarian textual layers. If we look again at our list of texts to be considered, we have three clear bodies of tradition:

1. D-material (CD; 4QD^a).
2. H-material (1QH^a; 4QH^d).
3. P-material (1QpHab; 1QpMic; 4Qpap pIsa^c; 4QpNah; 4QpPs^a; 4QpUnid; 4QpPs^b).

This leaves only 4QCatena A and 4QCommGen A, both of which constitute works of scriptural interpretation. 4QCatena A is regularly classed among the ‘thematic pesharim’ and so, in broad terms at least, is arguably best categorised as

⁸¹ For discussion of these scribal practices, see primarily Tov 1991; 1998; 2000.

⁸² See n.79 above.

belonging with the other pesher-material.⁸³ 4QCommGen A on the other hand exhibits traits similar to both those of the ‘thematic pesharim’ (Lim 2002, pp.16-18) and:

the legal, narrative, and theological sections of works like the Damascus Document. (Campbell 2004, p.18)

How best then to categorise it? On the one hand we could give precedence to its exegetical character (following Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a) and assign it alongside the pesher-material on these grounds. On the other hand, the precise exegetical method it employs is significantly different from that of the rest of the P-material delineated above (hence its official designation as a ‘commentary’ rather than ‘pesher’; see Brooke 1996).⁸⁴ Furthermore, while Brooke notes the “amazing variety of genres” within the text (2005a, p.156), the particular passage that interests us (4Q252 5.1-7) strongly parallels the language, structure and exegetical method of CD 6.2-11 (both, for example, make efforts to interpret the קקחמ of Genesis 49.10 and Numbers 21.18 respectively). Perhaps therefore we should acknowledge and take seriously the insight of Jonathan Campbell (2004, pp.17-18; also Brooke 1994b, pp.173, 176; 1994c, pp.56-57) and tentatively locate the text so as to be examined alongside the D-material.

Accordingly, we shall for the present divide our thirteen texts into the following three (slightly broader) bodies of tradition:

1. D-material (CD; 4QD^a; 4QCommGen A [?]).
2. H-material (1QH^a; 4QH^d).
3. P-material (1QpHab; 1QpMic; 4Qpap pIsa^c; 4QpNah; 4QpPs^a; 4QpUnid; 4QpPs^b; 4QCatena A [?]).

⁸³ Berrin 2000b; 2005; Brooke 2000a; Campbell 2004, esp. pp.15-18, 45-55; Lim 2002, pp.14-18; Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a; Steudel 1992, p.538. Cf. Brooke 2005a (esp. p.149). For further discussion of the genre of 4QCatena A (4Q177) see Chapter Four.

⁸⁴ Bernstein 1994a, p.5; 1994b, p.62; 2000a; Berrin 2005, pp.113 (n.7), 122 (n.47), 130-131 (esp. n.81); Brooke 1994b, p.173; 2000b; Tov 1994, pp.116-117, esp. n.13. See further, Brooke 2005a, pp.153-155.

The fact remains that texts within a particular body of tradition may well have differing composition dates but, for now, we shall adopt this division as a potentially fruitful initial approach.

1.4.3. Layering the Texts

As has already been explored to some extent above, various proposals have been made with regard to the literary dependence and relative compositional dates of these three blocks of material. Most scholars regard the pesharim as one of the latest groups of sectarian texts to be produced.⁸⁵ Davies for example argues convincingly that much of the interpretive element in the P-material that cannot be derived from the scriptural lemma is dependent instead upon H-material (1987, pp.87-105). Brooke and Grossman, noting similarities in terminology and content, suggest that the P-material might represent “an outgrowth of and response to” the D-material (Grossman 2002, p.156).⁸⁶ Bengtsson combines these elements, claiming that the P-material has been shaped by both the H-material *and* the D-material (2000a, pp.288-290).

Hartmut Stegemann and Annette Steudel have further suggested that the H-material might represent an earlier sectarian layer than the D-material. For Stegemann, who accepts that a historical figure referred to as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ authored a significant portion of the Hodayot, the Damascus Document’s apparent allusion to this figure’s death (CD 19.33 – 20.1; 20.13-15) renders it *ipso facto* a later text.⁸⁷ While he makes a good *prima facie* case, it may

⁸⁵ E.g. Bengtsson 2000a, pp.288-290; Brooke 1991a, pp.228-229; Cross 1995, pp.89-97; Davies 1987, pp.87-105; Grossman 2002, pp.155-157; Jokiranta 2005b, pp.256-257; Knibb 1994a, pp.13-15, 157-158, 209, 221, 247; Rabinowitz 1953; Stegemann 1998, pp.122-133; VanderKam 1994a, pp.106-108. One notable exception is Barbara Thiering (2000), who argues that various of the pesharim (including 1QpHab and 4Q171) pre-date the H-material, which in turn pre-dates the D-material. Her argument however relies heavily on the results of AMS dating (the problems associated with which we have already noted; see n.75 above), the unfounded assumption that where texts have survived in only one copy they *must* be autographs, and her own historical presuppositions regarding the context in which the scrolls were produced.

⁸⁶ Brooke 1991a, pp.228-229; Grossman 2002, pp.155-157.

⁸⁷ Stegemann 1998, pp.107, 116-118.

be observed that this position does not allow for the possibility that the D-material might contain later glosses (see, for example, n.78 above). Further to this, note the apparent presentation of the ‘teacher’ as a future figure in CD 6.10-11.⁸⁸ Steudel’s argument on the other hand for the relative dating of the H- and D-material is demonstrated by her examination of the developing concept of ‘Belial’ among the sectarian texts (2000, pp.338-339); though credible, this is at present only a tentative proposal.

It may be that, for the time being, we cannot clearly distinguish the H- and D-material. Nevertheless there appears to be general agreement in most quarters with regard to our three bodies of tradition, that these two blocks of material precede (and have quite possibly influenced) the P-material.⁸⁹ In this way, and without assigning any specific dates to texts, we can tentatively line up two sectarian textual layers relative to each other:

1. Early Sectarian Layer (H- and D-material)
2. Late Sectarian Layer (P-material)

However, with regard to the D-material in particular, there are further complicating factors. Several scholars have noted evidence of redaction in the Damascus Document and have suggested that it might contain earlier source material, perhaps pre-dating the formation of the specific group associated with the ‘teacher’ (cf. Hempel 2000, pp.44-53). For instance, Murphy-O’Connor has argued that there are four main discernible sources in the ‘Admonition’ portion of CD: a missionary document (2.14 – 6.1), a memorandum (6.11b – 8.3), a document criticising the ruling class in Judah (8.3-18) and the *Grundschrift* of CD 19.33 – 20.22b aimed at disaffected members of the community (19.33 –

⁸⁸ This shall be discussed further in Chapter Two.

⁸⁹ See for example: Bengtsson 2000a, pp.288-290; Brooke 1991a, pp.228-229; Charlesworth 2002, p.74; Cross 1995, pp.89-97; Davies 1987, pp.87-105; Dupont-Sommer 1961, pp.114-120, 198-201, 255-258, 349; Grossman 2002, pp.155-157; Jokiranta 2005b, pp.256-257; Knibb 1994a, pp.13-15, 157-158, 209, 221, 247; Stegemann 1998, pp.80-138, esp. pp.107, 116-118, 122-133; VanderKam 1994a, pp.106-108.

20.1b; 20.8b-13; 17b-22b).⁹⁰ The first two of these (2.14 – 6.1; 6.11b – 8.3) he assigns to a group pre-dating that of the ‘teacher’. In addition he identifies various supplementary components and interpolations (1972, pp.562-563).⁹¹

Davies however has taken issue with aspects of Murphy-O’Connor’s reconstruction (e.g. Davies 1983, esp. pp.41-47; 1987, pp.33-49) and, refining the approach further, argues convincingly instead that CD 1.1 – 7.9 and 20.27b-34 (plus the ‘Laws’; CD 9-16) constitute the original document, with 7.10 – 8.19 as a subsequent addition.⁹² He consequently views a third layer, CD 19.33b – 20.27a, as the mainstay of a ‘Qumranic’, or perhaps more accurately ‘Yahadic’, redaction (constituting a revision by the ‘Yahad’, the community of the ‘teacher’, having split from the parent group responsible for the original document).⁹³ To this Yahadic redaction, Davies adds a number of other glosses, including notably for our purposes: 1.11a; 1.13-18a; 4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14 – 8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a.⁹⁴

In the context of her work comparing the Damascus Document and the Community Rule, Metso likewise stresses that:

it is important to pay attention to the *composite nature* of the rule texts when they are compared and focus on *individual redactional units* rather than on complete documents as if they were literary unities. (Metso 2004, pp.330-331; my italics)

There are dissenting voices which argue for the literary unity of the text (e.g. Dimant 1984, pp.490-497; cf. Campbell 1999).⁹⁵ Nevertheless, a convincing case

⁹⁰ Murphy-O’Connor 1970; 1971a; 1971b; 1972; 1974; 1985.

⁹¹ Cf. Hempel 2000, pp.46-47.

⁹² Davies 1983 (esp. pp.198-201).

⁹³ Davies 1983. Charlesworth likewise suggests that some texts, including the Damascus Document, appear to have “obtained their present form through an evolutionary process that mirrors somewhat the historical stages of the Qumran Essenes” (1980, p.233). See too: Boccaccini 1998, p.120; Brooke 1991a, pp.218-221; Wassen 2005, pp.32-33; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996, p.50. Note the critique of Davies’ hypothesis in Collins 1985.

⁹⁴ See Davies 1983, pp.194-197, 232-267. Isaac Rabinowitz similarly highlights the presence of “glosses and comments upon the admonitory discourse” (1953, p.175, n.2; cf. 1954).

⁹⁵ Furthermore, while Mark Boyce acknowledges the existence of a redactional process, his examination of the poetry of the Damascus Document leads him to suggest that references to ‘the

can seemingly be made that the Damascus Document should indeed be regarded as containing both Yahadic *and* pre-Yahadic material. More particularly, this thesis finds Davies' proposal, defended and expanded upon in numerous subsequent articles (Davies 1985; 1987; 1988; 1989; 1990a; 1990b; 1992; 1994; 1996, pp.45-60, 139-150, 163-177; 2000a; 2000b; 2000c; 2002; 2005; see also n.93 above), the most convincing and it is therefore this approach to the text that shall be adopted in our present study.⁹⁶

By virtue of the pre-Yahadic nature of much of the Damascus Document (pre-dating the present redaction of the text, that has above already been equated with the H-material as the product of an 'Early Sectarian Layer'), we are presented with *three* broad textual layers:⁹⁷

1. Formative Sectarian Layer (pre-Yahadic D-material)⁹⁸
2. Early Sectarian Layer (Yahadic D-material and H-material)
3. Late Sectarian Layer (P-material)

The extent to which these can be regarded as distinct remains questionable given the evidence for ongoing redaction. At best it is a blunt approximation, based on the evidence at our disposal, of the chronological development of these blocks of

teacher' at least (e.g. CD 1.11) are original rather than the result of later redaction (Boyce 1990; *contra* Davies 1983). Also Knibb 1994b, pp.155-156; Wassen 2005, p.33, n.66.

⁹⁶ Accordingly we can highlight CD 1.1 – 8.19 and 20.27b-34 (plus the 'Laws'; CD 9-16) as pre-Yahadic D-material, while 19.33b – 20.27a along with the various glosses (e.g. 1.11a; 1.13-18a; 4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14 – 8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a) constitutes Yahadic D-material.

⁹⁷ 4QCommGen A (4Q252) is to be placed alongside the specifically Yahadic D-material belonging to the Early Sectarian Layer. Though, as noted above, the passage we are most concerned with (4Q252 5.1-7) parallels the language, structure and exegetical method of CD 6.2-11 (pre-Yahadic D-material according to Davies' schema), it does so in the context of *אנשי הקהילה* ('the Men of the Community/Yahad'; 4Q252 5.5) thereby explicitly revealing itself to belong with the other Yahadic material (cf. perhaps *אנשי הקהילה*; CD 20.32). So too Brooke 1994b, p.174, n.26; García Martínez 1995b, p.161.

⁹⁸ The label '*Formative* Sectarian Layer' is preferable to either 'Pre-Sectarian' or 'Earliest Sectarian', making the point that this particular textual layer constitutes a 'pre-stage' to our subsequent (Yahadic) layers, while maintaining a certain ambiguity with regard to its precise relationship and origin. See n.5 of the Introduction. Cf. Grossman 2002, pp.24-41; Wacholder 1990, p.273.

material. Nevertheless, in broad terms it appears to agree with both the relative dating of these texts suggested by Bengtsson (2000a, pp.288-290), Brooke (1991a, pp.228-229), Davies (1987, pp.87-105) and Grossman (2002, pp.155-157), and with the findings derived from a close textual analysis of the Damascus Document (e.g. Davies 1983; Murphy-O'Connor 1972; 1985; cf. Hempel 2000, pp.44-53).⁹⁹ It is therefore this threefold chronological schema that we shall employ as a backdrop to our present examination of the sobriquets in the Qumran-related scrolls.

1.5. Conclusions

It should be apparent by this point that this thesis makes a number of important assumptions. Firstly, that the Qumran-related scrolls represent a homogeneous, rather than disparate, collection (regardless of whether their origin is to be sought in Jerusalem, Qumran or elsewhere).¹⁰⁰ Secondly, that we can speak in broad terms of a movement behind the scrolls with a possible history of internal division represented therein.¹⁰¹ To what extent this movement might be regarded as Essene-related or otherwise will not be addressed here. Thirdly, the sobriquets appearing in the Qumran-related scrolls represent an internal labelling system adopted by this movement (or part thereof) as a means of character evaluation, transparent in its original context.¹⁰² Fourthly, given that the scrolls themselves appear to have been written over a period of time and contain evidence of development and redaction (see n.64 above), that the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process.¹⁰³ Fifthly, this thesis assumes

⁹⁹ It is to be acknowledged that the Damascus Document has received substantially more scholarly attention with regard to its redaction and literary development than the H- or P-material, hence our rather more thorough examination of the former here. Our chronological schema could therefore be further improved by the inclusion of similar data, if forthcoming, from an analysis of any evident redactional history in the H- or P-material. With regard to the H-material, the groundwork for this has already been laid by Svend Holm-Nielsen (1960, esp. pp.316-331).

¹⁰⁰ E.g. Davies 2000a; Dimant 2000; Tov 2000; van der Woude 1998.

¹⁰¹ See n.5 of the Introduction.

¹⁰² So too Bengtsson 2000a.

¹⁰³ As similarly suggested elsewhere: Bengtsson 2000a, pp.288-290; Davies 1987, pp.97-105; Fröhlich 1999.

as reasonable the possibility that ‘non-standard’ forms of these sobriquets might bear witness to this process.

Having now established a tentative chronological schema, we shall proceed by examining all apparent occurrences of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטף הכזב (along with ‘variant’ forms) across our three sectarian textual layers in order to see whether convincing evidence of sobriquet development can indeed be found therein. We shall also examine instances of related terminology where appropriate to facilitate our understanding of this process.¹⁰⁴ As already stated, it is to be hoped that in this manner it will be possible to identify any trends or practices that may appear with regard to the (differing?) use and/or formation of sobriquets within or between these chronological groups, thus informing us about the process of sobriquet development among the Qumran-related texts.

¹⁰⁴ It is important to assert that the focus of this study is literary rather than historical. Though we may touch upon it in places, our aim is not primarily to engage with the historical question. Our discussion focuses upon ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ and ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ as *labels* without necessarily passing comment upon historical realia. We may assume that there is some relationship between the worlds of the literary and the historical, though whether or not we are able to comment upon the latter should not detract from our fundamentally literary investigation.

2.

Formative Sectarian Layer

2.1. Introduction

The first of our three broad textual layers to undergo examination is what we have dubbed the 'Formative Sectarian Layer'. Derived from our analysis in the previous chapter of pre-Yahadic material in the Damascus Document, this constitutes a discernible 'pre-stage' to our two other (Yahadic) sectarian textual layers. Philip Davies suggests that CD 1.1 – 8.19 and 20.27b-34 (plus the 'Laws'; CD 9-16) pre-date the establishment of a 'Yahad' (יָהָד; 'community') under the leadership of 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.¹ To what extent therefore this material can be regarded as strictly 'sectarian' depends upon our definition of the term and whether we extend its application beyond the immediate group of 'the Teacher'. For the purposes of this thesis we shall maintain a definition that encompasses the broader movement behind the scrolls.² Nevertheless, our adoption of the term 'Formative Sectarian' (as opposed to 'Pre-Sectarian' or 'Earliest Sectarian') makes the point that this particular textual layer constitutes a 'pre-stage' to our subsequent (Yahadic) layers, while maintaining a certain ambiguity with regard to its precise relationship and origin.³

For our present investigation of the sobriquets in the Qumran-related texts, this Formative Sectarian Layer (FSL) contains only pre-Yahadic D-material.⁴ Of all the various occurring forms of 'teaching righteousness' listed in

¹ See primarily Davies 1983. CD 19.33b – 20.27a, along with the various glosses (e.g. 1.11a; 1.13-18a; 4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14 – 8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a), are considered the product of a Yahadic redaction. Cf. Chapter One, n.93. This present thesis adopts such an approach; hence our use of the terms 'pre-Yahadic' and 'Yahadic' in reference to the D-material. Note however: Boyce 1990; Campbell 1999; Dimant 1984 (pp.490-497).

² See further n.5 of the Introduction. Also, Jokiranta 2001.

³ Cf. Chapter One, n.98.

⁴ However, other texts, not examined here, may also arguably belong to this 'pre-Yahadic' layer, such as perhaps the Temple Scroll and 4QMMT (Callaway 1990, pp.647-649; Davies 1989;

the previous chapter, only one is to be located in this textual layer (CD 6.11), while none of the forms associated with ‘spouting lies’ are to be found (we shall, however, examine an instance of related terminology (CD 6.1) that may have some bearing upon our discussion).⁵ This chapter is, accordingly, to be rather shorter than the two which follow it, though this enforced brevity may in itself be of some significance in our final analysis. In terms of how we shall proceed, while presented with only one text for investigation here, generally speaking with regard to our sectarian layers we shall treat each text to be considered *in turn*, examining all apparent occurrences of the sobriquets מִטִּיף and מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק (along with both ‘variant’ forms and related terminology where appropriate). In this manner, attention can be paid to the interplay between designations within a given text, while such an approach will furthermore allow us to avoid artificially amalgamating texts too readily within a given textual layer.⁶

2.2. Sobriquets in the Formative Sectarian Layer

2.2.1. The (Pre-Yahadic) Damascus Document

2.2.1.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’

CD 6.2-11a

As stated above, of all the various occurring forms of ‘teaching righteousness’ listed in the previous chapter, only one falls among the pre-

2000b, pp.40-42; Schiffman 1994, pp.83-95, 257-271; 2000a). “Thus, the caves of Qumran may have preserved writings which antedate the foundation of the *Yahad*” (Wacholder 1990, p.273).

⁵ An apparent reference to ‘seeking smooth things’ is located in this layer at CD 1.18 (paralleled in 4Q266 frag.2, 1.21), though this will be examined in Chapter Five.

⁶ As might, for example, be a danger if we were to examine *all* references to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ across a textual layer and then *all* references to ‘the Spouter of the Lie’. We cannot, for instance, assume that the D- and H-material categorised as belonging to the Early Sectarian Layer share an identical perspective. A comparison of various sobriquet occurrences across different texts within a textual layer can then take place retrospectively.

Yahadic portions of the Damascus Document.⁷ This forms the culmination of a passage that would appear to describe the origins of a group:

^{6,2}But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers, and he raised up from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel ³men of wisdom and caused them to hear, and they dug the well; “a well that the princes dug, that ⁴the nobles of the people excavated with a sceptre.” The ‘well’ is הַתּוֹרָה, and those who dug it are ⁵the שְׂבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל who went forth from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, ⁶all of whom God called ‘princes’, for they sought him {דִּרְשׁוּהוּ} and their renown was not ⁷rejected by anyone’s mouth. And the ‘sceptre’ is דִּוְרַשׁ הַתּוֹרָה, of whom ⁸Isaiah said, “He brings forth a tool for his work.” And the ‘nobles of the people’ are ⁹those who come to excavate the ‘well’ with the sceptres {/decrees} which ‘the sceptre’ decreed ¹⁰to walk in during all the age of wickedness *and without which they shall obtain nothing*, until there shall arise יִיֹרָה הַצֶּדֶק¹¹ at the end of days. (CD 6.2-11a)⁸

This passage is paralleled in 4Q266 (frag.3, 2.9b-17a) and partially in 4Q267 (frag.2, 7-15) and 6Q15 (frag.3, 5), though, due to the poor state of preservation, יִיֹרָה הַצֶּדֶק is not attested. How are we best to understand this designation? Solomon Schechter, who first published the Damascus Document in 1910 after the discovery of the CD manuscripts in the Cairo genizah, opted for ‘the teacher of righteousness’, regarding יִיֹרָה as a simple variant of מוֹרָה (cf. CD 1.11; 20.32).⁹ Most scholars however render it more generally as either ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Knibb 1994a), ‘he ... who shall teach righteousness’ (Vermes 2004), ‘one who teaches righteousness’ (Roth 1963, p.95; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or ‘he who teaches justice’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997). Though the majority regard יִיֹרָה as a verbal form (specifically an imperfect *hiphil* from the root יָרָה), as Davies points out:

⁷ In terms of potentially related terminology, note the presence of צִדִּיק in this layer (e.g. CD 1.18 – 2.1). This will, however, be examined retrospectively by means of comparison in our analysis of the Hodayot in Chapter Three.

⁸ Italics signify a Yahadic interpolation, following Davies 1983, p.247 (also Murphy-O’Connor 1971a, pp.230-231).

⁹ Schechter 1970, p.70. Cf. Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.131. See further, Rabinowitz 1958, p.393 (cf. 1954, p.22, n.52). Indeed, Gregory Doudna suggests that יִיֹרָה הַצֶּדֶק is in fact a scribal error for מוֹרָה הַצֶּדֶק (2001, pp.686-689).

Since **יורה הצדק** and not **יורה את הצדק** is written, **יורה** is capable of being construed as nominal rather than verbal, forming a construct with the following noun (Davies 1996, p.89; cf. 1988, p.313).

Clearly there is some terminological similarity between **יורה הצדק** and the sobriquet ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’. While a degree of ambiguity remains with regard to translation, we shall adopt ‘one who will teach righteousness’ as a rendering that retains fully both the sense of the phrase and this association, without overstepping what can be said.

It is often suggested that the ‘standard’ form **מורה הצדק** has its origins in scriptural passages such as Joel 2.23 and Hosea 10.12 (e.g. Brownlee 1979, pp.47-48; Burrows 1956, pp.144-145; Lim 2002, pp.74-75; Rabinowitz 1958, p.397; Roth 1963).¹⁰ Håkan Bengtsson disagrees however and, concerned primarily with the sobriquet as it appears in the pesharim, relegates these passages to the role of “secondary biblical support” (2000a, p.216).¹¹ In either case, it would be prudent to examine them here afresh in relation to our earliest discernible occurrence of terminology pertaining to the teaching of righteousness (**יורה הצדק**; CD 6.11). Joel 2.23 reads:

O children of Zion, be glad and rejoice in the LORD your God; for he has given the early rain for your vindication {**את־המורה לצדקה**}, he has poured down {**יורד**} for you abundant rain, the early and the later rain {**מורה ומלקוש**}, as before. (Joel 2.23)

Significantly, the noun **מורה** (here in the sense of ‘early rain’, though it can also mean ‘teacher’; cf. Clines (ed.) 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995) is found in the context of **צדק**. Furthermore, *BHS* notes with regard to the second occurrence that multiple manuscripts read **יורה** instead (cf. CD 6.11). William Brownlee suggests that the writers of the scrolls understood this passage in

¹⁰ Cf. Schechter 1970, p.63, n.16.

¹¹ Intriguingly, Bengtsson proposes that the Damascus Document itself should be considered the source of **מורה הצדק** (2000a, pp.191-196, 288-290), a hypothesis that our present investigation may further illuminate. It should be acknowledged that this position does not preclude the possibility that passages such as Joel 2.23 and Hosea 10.12 might have nevertheless influenced the employment and/or formation of designations in the Damascus Document.

reference to an individual (accordingly: “for he has given you *the one who showers* [or, *teaches*] *righteousness*”; 1979, p.47).¹² If there is any merit in the association of Joel 2.23 with CD 6.10-11 this may at least have been the position taken by the author of the (pre-Yahadic) Damascus Document; hence יורה הצדק (‘one who will teach righteousness’). However, aside from the coupling of the roots ירה and צדק, there is nothing in either Joel 2.23 or the surrounding text that bears any clear parallel to CD 6.2-11a; thus we cannot convincingly demonstrate a dependence upon this scriptural passage.

More intriguing however in terms of terminology and context is Hosea 10.12. This reads:

Sow for yourselves righteousness; reap steadfast love; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek {לדרוש} the LORD, that he may come {עד-יבוא} and rain righteousness {ירה צדק} upon you. (Hosea 10.12)

The phrase עד-יבוא וירה צדק bears close structural and terminological resemblance to עד עמד יורה הצדק (CD 6.10-11). Furthermore, in both cases this event takes place as a consequence of ‘seeking’ God (cf. CD 6.6: דרשוהו). Cecil Roth suggests that, as with Joel 2.23, the scriptural passage may have been understood in reference to an individual teacher (thus: “It is time to seek the Lord, until He shall come who shall teach righteousness to you”; 1963, p.93).¹³ Indeed, this is the understanding preserved in both the Targum and Vulgate (J.M. Baumgarten 1979, pp.230-231; Burrows 1956, p.145; Reeves 1988, pp.289-290).¹⁴ Of greater significance still, the Karaites shared this interpretation of Hosea 10.12 and from it derived the label מורה צדק for an anticipated eschatological messianic figure.¹⁵

¹² So too Roth 1963. J.M. Baumgarten further notes that this is the understanding held in the Targum and Vulgate (1979, p.231, n.52).

¹³ Cf. Brownlee 1979, pp.47-48; Burrows 1956, p.145.

¹⁴ Cf. n.12 above.

¹⁵ See primarily, Polliack 2005, pp.191-195. Also Brownlee 1979, pp.48-49. Note in this context the future orientation of עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים (CD 6.10-11).

Other, more obscure, scriptural provenances for the act of ‘teaching righteousness’ have also been suggested (see Bengtsson 2000a, pp.191-195; Fröhlich 1999, pp.302-305; Lim 2002, pp.74-75), though these bear little (if any) relation to the immediate context of CD 6.2-11a. While Joel 2.23 simply attests the combination of the relevant root forms (moreover in the distinct form **לְצַדִּיקָה**), Hosea 10.12 shares several notable points of contact (terminological, structural and contextual) with CD 6.2-11a and therefore alone can be said to have perhaps had some influence on the shaping of **יֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק**.¹⁶ Thus an expectation of the fulfilment of Hosea 10.12 (reinterpreted) can be seen to lie behind CD 6.10-11; seeking (**דֹּרֵשׁ**) God will lead to his coming and raining righteousness (**עַד-יָבוֹא וִירָה צִדִּיק**; Hosea 10.12), understood as the arrival of ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (**עַד עֹמֵד יֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק**; CD 6.10-11).¹⁷

This event appears not yet to have happened in the context of this passage but is instead anticipated ‘at the end of days’ or, literally, ‘in the last (of the) days’ (**בְּאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים**; CD 6.11).¹⁸ Brooke prefers the translation ‘the latter days’, thus avoiding the apparent abrupt finality of ‘the end of days’, and argues that **אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים** denotes a period of time before the end which “is already

¹⁶ So too Campbell 1995a, pp.88-99 (esp. p.92). It should be noted that Bengtsson not only denies scriptural provenance to the ‘standard’ form, **מֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק** (claiming its origins lie in the Damascus Document itself; see n.11 above), but also to the ‘antecedent forms’ found in the latter text (2000a, pp.288-290). His reasoning is that “we do not have any evidence for the interpretation ‘teacher’ of the **יֹרֵה** and the **הַמֹּרֵה** in Hos and Joel in the Qumran context” (2000a, p.289). This seems counterintuitive, especially since (as our examination above has demonstrated) CD 6.10-11 itself at least would appear to attest such an interpretation of Hosea 10.12. Indeed, Bengtsson concludes that “some sobriquets must have been moulded without suitable biblical passages” (2000a, p.290). Conversely, Ida Fröhlich, in her examination of ‘Qumran names’, concludes emphatically that “they are not ad hoc inventions of the authors of the works... This traditional language, worked into the community and contaminated with other systems, *issued from other biblical texts*” (1999, p.305; my italics). While his suggestion that the origins of the ‘standard’ form, **מֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק**, are to be sought in the Damascus Document would appear congruent with our examination thus far, this thesis remains unconvinced (and somewhat baffled) by Bengtsson’s insistence that the designation **יֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק** (CD 6.11) is without scriptural derivation.

¹⁷ Russell Fuller’s analysis of the text of Hosea 10.12 in 4Q82 (4QXII⁸) likewise supports this conclusion (1992, pp.254-256; cf. 1997). On the personification of **צִדִּיק**, see J.M. Baumgarten 1979 (esp. pp.230-233).

¹⁸ See Collins 2000a; Kosmala 1978a; Steudel 1993.

being experienced” (1985, p.176; so too Stegemann 1992, pp.153-154).¹⁹ Such an interpretation may influence our understanding of the implied timetable for the arrival of the ‘one who will teach righteousness’. Though Phillip Callaway notes that CD 6.10-11 appears to concern a future figure, he astutely adds:

This depends, of course on, when one dates the end of days. If the writer or reader viewed himself as living already in the last days, this figure might be considered a relative contemporary. (Callaway 1988, p.115)

John Collins casts doubt on Brooke’s assertion that **אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים** is already being experienced (from the perspective of the Damascus Document at least), though he concedes that ‘the end of days’ might refer to a period of time rather than the end of time itself (1994a, pp.195-199; cf. 2000a). A potentially useful approach might be borrowed from an analogy Albert Baumgarten draws between eschatological expectation as conceived by the authors of the scrolls and by contemporary millenarian movements such as Jehovah’s Witnesses (2000, pp.13-14). In this light, ‘the end of days’ is the final climatic period (itself of unspecified length), the commencement of which can be both variously identified and indefinitely postponed. It follows therefore that at different times some or all of those responsible for the scrolls may have considered themselves as on the brink of, or even in the midst of, ‘the end of days’.²⁰

Consequently, CD 6.10-11 appears in general terms to have expressed an expectation of a figure yet to come. Exactly when this event was supposed to occur however may well have varied in the minds of both author and reader depending on the projected imminence of **אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים**. On the other hand the reverse may also have been true. As Davies puts it:

The ‘end of days’ might signify the arrival of the Teacher: more pertinently, *the arrival of the Teacher would signify the ‘end of days’*. (Davies 1988, p.315; cf. 1996, p.91)

¹⁹ Cf. 4Q398 (4QMMT^c) frags 11-13, 4: **וְזֶה הוּא אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים**.

²⁰ See further the discussion by Shemaryahu Talmon (2003).

In this sense the ‘one who will teach righteousness’ might be interpreted as an eschatological figure in the mindset of those awaiting his arrival. Might this furthermore have messianic undertones? Some support for this perspective may come from a parallel passage also constituting part of the pre-Yahadic Damascus Document. Compare:

^{6.10}to walk in during all the age of wickedness (...), until there shall arise ¹¹one who will teach righteousness at the end of days. (CD 6.10-11)

^{12.23}those who walk in these in the age of wickedness, until there shall arise the messiah of Aaron ^{13.1}and Israel (CD 12.23 – 13.1)

That these statements existed alongside each other in the pre-Yahadic text of the Damascus Document may indicate that the ‘one who will teach righteousness’ was anticipated as the (singular?) ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (משיח אהרן וישראל).²¹

In the light of the above, there are three significant possibilities regarding the relationship (if any) between the ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ and the figure that appears elsewhere among the scrolls as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה הצדק). Firstly that, given the apparent references to

²¹ משיח corrected from משוח (following Qimron 1992a). A messianic reading of CD 6.10-11 is advanced by Davies (1983; 1988; and especially 2000c) and Dupont-Sommer (1954, p.54); see too Callaway (1988, p.113), Knibb (1994a, p.50) and Vermes (2004, p.86). CD 19.10-11, also part of the FSL, similarly anticipates the ‘visitation’ (הפקדה) of ‘the messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (cf. 14.19). The issue of messianism is further complicated both by the suggestion elsewhere among the scrolls that individual messiahs from Aaron and Israel were expected (e.g. 1QS 9.11) and by the potential for uncritically conflating texts. Consequently Vermes, amalgamating the messianic perspectives of various sectarian texts, identifies the ‘one who will teach righteousness’ with ‘the messiah of Aaron’ alone (2004, p.86; so too Knibb 1994a, p.50). Brooke highlights however that the Damascus Document must be recognised as attesting more than one perspective (the product of redaction) and further suggests that, in its earliest form, only a single messianic figure was anticipated (1980; 1991a). On addressing the ambiguous nature of messianic expectation in the scrolls see: Collins 1995a; 2000b; Duhaime 2000a; Evans 2000a; 2000b; García Martínez 1995b (esp. pp.178-179); Horbury 1998 (esp. pp.59-63); Lichtenberger 2003. Despite the ambiguity that arises when the scrolls are conflated, with regard to the FSL of the Damascus Document at least it is certainly arguable that, on the grounds of similarity between CD 12.23 – 13.1 and 6.10-11 (and the use of a verb in the singular following the designation in CD 14.19; cf. Brooke 1991a, p.222; García Martínez 1995b, p.179; VanderKam 1994b, pp.228-231), the expectation was of a singular ‘messiah of Aaron *and* Israel’, described as ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’. We shall return to this issue in subsequent chapters.

the latter figure's death in CD 19.33 – 20.17, 6.10-11 anticipates his return 'at the end of days' (Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.131, n.6; Schechter 1970, p.45). Secondly, that the expected messianic **מורה הצדק** is distinct from the historical **מורה הצדק** (Collins 1995a, pp.102-135; Knibb 1990, pp.56-60). Thirdly, that the figure appearing elsewhere among the (presumably later) texts as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (**מורה הצדק**) was acclaimed as the 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' anticipated in CD 6.10-11 (Davies 1988; Wise 1999, pp.202-209).²² The first of these, while understandable as a reading, has little in the way of corroborative evidence from the texts and has not found widespread acceptance.²³ The second is the most commonly held response but has been criticised on several counts, not least that it posits *two* teachers though nowhere else among the scrolls is an 'eschatological counterpart' to the role of 'the Teacher of Righteousness' implied.²⁴ The third has again been criticised on several counts, including notably that elsewhere the historical teacher appears to pre-date 'the end of days'.²⁵

For our present examination we are prohibited from accepting the first of these possibilities since it would appear that the FSL knows of no historical 'Teacher of Righteousness' whose return could here be predicted. The only teacher to be found in this sectarian textual layer is the one who is awaited 'at the end of days'. Thus, of the two remaining alternatives, the third seems as if it might prove the most congruent with our chronological layering of the texts. This is hardly surprising since the proposal is that of Philip Davies, whose work on the redaction of the Damascus Document we have drawn upon heavily in the creation

²² As a fourth possibility, Doudna attempts to remove the future orientation of CD 6.10-11 entirely by regarding **מורה הצדק** as a scribal error for **מורה הצדק** and suggesting that **ער עמר** is not in fact original to the text (2001, pp.686-689). His endeavour is contrived however and ultimately unconvincing.

²³ Though on belief in resurrection in the scrolls, see Puech 1994, pp.246-256.

²⁴ E.g. see Davies 1988, p.313.

²⁵ Cf. 1QpHab 2.1-10a. See Collins 1994a, pp.203-204. Michael Knibb further advances the criticism that nowhere else is it suggested that the 'teacher' was regarded in a messianic light, as would appear to be the case with **מורה הצדק** (1990, p.59). This issue, along with the nature of the designation **משיח הצדק** (4Q252 5.3), will be discussed further in Chapter Three.

of our schema. Nevertheless it appears on other grounds the most convincing, being arguably more straightforward in its reconciliation of these ‘teacher’ designations (without resort to the reincarnation or multiplication of teachers) and displaying heightened sensitivity to the shifting perspectives that can accompany textual development and redaction.²⁶

This expectation of ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ is set firmly in the context of a pre-existing group, consisting of:

^{6,2}from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel ³men of wisdom (... ⁴...) ⁵the ⁶שְׂבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל who went forth from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus (CD 6.2-5)

Various translations of שְׂבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל have been suggested, including ‘the converts of Israel’ (deriving שְׂבִי from שׁוּב: Knibb 1983, pp.105-107; 1994a, pp.48-49; Vermes 2004), ‘the returnees of Israel’ (similarly derived from שׁוּב: Iwry 1969; 1994; Murphy-O’Connor 1970, pp.211-214; 1972, pp.545-546) and ‘the captivity of Israel’ (derived from שְׁבִי: Davies 1983, pp.92-95; 1987, pp.43-44; Rabinowitz 1954, pp.16-17, n.20; Schechter 1970, pp.67, 70).²⁷ An exegetical approach to Numbers 21.18 within the passage reveals this group to be those who ‘dug the well’ with the aid of ‘a sceptre’ (CD 6.3-4). The ‘well’ is further revealed to be הַתּוֹרָה, while the ‘sceptre’ is דּוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה (‘the Seeker of the Law’), the ‘tool’ of Isaiah 54.16.²⁸

²⁶ In response to Collins’ criticism that elsewhere ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ pre-dates אַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים (see n.25 above), we have already noted the flexibility with which ‘the end of days’ can be both applied and postponed. It is only to be expected that the calculation of this period might undergo reinterpretation in the light of subsequent events, perhaps represented in later sectarian layers, of which the eventual death of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ would surely count.

²⁷ Note that in Murphy-O’Connor’s later work he claims to find the translation ‘returnees of Israel’ “impossible to maintain” (1985, p.232) and instead gives support to the rendering ‘the converts of Israel’ (1985, pp.232-233).

²⁸ In addition to the meaning ‘sceptre’, as found in Numbers 21.18, מַחֲקֶק can also be taken (as a denominative of חָק) to mean ‘one who prescribes decrees’ or ‘lawgiver’ (Clines (ed.) 1996; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1994; 1995; cf. Victor 1966). This dual meaning presumably lies behind the Damascus Document’s equivalence of the ‘sceptre’ (Num 21.18) and ‘the Seeker of the Law’ (cf. Rabinowitz 1954, p.21; Schonfield 1956, p.32). It should be noted however that

According to CD 6.7-11, 'the Seeker of the Law' is the one who issued the decrees that should be walked in 'during all the age of wickedness (...), until there shall arise one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (CD 6.10-11). It is notable that this law is valid only for the interim period ('the age of wickedness'; cf. 15.6-10) and may therefore be abrogated by the anticipated **יורה הצדק** 'at the end of days'.²⁹ His very title is reminiscent of the fact that in Hosea 10.12 the act of 'seeking' (**דרש**) is a necessary prerequisite for the 'raining' / 'teaching' of righteousness.³⁰ It has been claimed that 'the Seeker of the Law' (**דורש התורה**) is simply an alternative designation to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (**מורה הצדק**) and that both refer to the same historical figure.³¹ Others argue that two distinct figures are here referred to, the former being a precursor for the latter.³² Certainly the evidence of CD 6.2-11a would indicate that 'the Seeker of the Law' pre-dates the anticipated **יורה הצדק**.³³ It will

John Elwolde questions whether **מחזק** was ever understood as 'sceptre' within the context of the Qumran-related sectarian literature and proposes instead that, rather than the object of a pun, it was simply read unambiguously as 'lawgiver' (2000, pp.2-11).

²⁹ Davies claims CD 4.8-9 (and perhaps 1.5-7) might indicate efforts to calculate the length of this interim period (2000b, p.34).

³⁰ It is in order to bring out this terminological context and maintain consistency that we have elected to render **דורש התורה** 'the *Seeker* of the Law' rather than, as would be equally valid, 'the Interpreter of the Law' (cf. **דרש** in Clines (ed.) 1995; Koehler and Baumgartner 1994). For a similar rendering, see: Brin 1995, p.51; Dimant 1984, p.494; Rabinowitz 1954; 1958, pp.397-398; Wiesenbergs 1955, pp.302-303. The implication of the title is in either case that it denotes an authority responsible for the correct discernment of **התורה**. Cf. **דורשי החלקות** (see Chapter Five).

³¹ E.g. Allegro 1956a, p.176; Bengtsson 2000a, p.182; Collins 1994a; 1995a, pp.102-104; Knibb 1990, pp.56-63; 2000a.

³² E.g. Callaway 1988, pp.108-116; Davies 1983, pp.123-125; 1988, pp.314-315; 1989, p.205; Murphy-O'Connor 1985; Wise 1999, pp.202-209. Conversely, Hugh Schonfield suggests that 'the Seeker of the Law' might be a successor to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (1956, p.36).

³³ The designation has furthermore been associated with Moses, Ezra or Nehemiah, or regarded as a title applied to a series of 'seekers' (cf. 1QS 6.6-8; 4Q174 frag.1, 1.11-12); see the excellent summaries by Phillip Callaway (1988, pp.108-116; 1990, esp. pp.641-644). Even if the **יורה הצדק** was, on arrival, acclaimed as one of a series of 'seekers', he is nevertheless demonstrably distinct in CD 6.2-11a from the **דורש התורה** who is associated with the origins of the movement. Davies further suggests that 'the Seeker of the Law' might simply be a "halakhic fiction" (Davies 1989, pp.204-206).

suffice for the present therefore to note that, with regard to the FSL, דורש is presented as a figure of authority who has already come to a group described as the שבִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל and has issued decrees that are to be upheld ‘until there shall arise one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (CD 6.10-11a).

Within this textual layer ‘the Seeker of the Law’ is a figure prior, both chronologically and ideologically, to any teacher-figure. More importantly for our purposes however, in terms of sobriquet development the *only* known ‘teacher’ of the FSL is the one described as יורה הצדק (CD 6.11). The arrival of this figure, perhaps to be identified with ‘the messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (cf. CD 12.23 – 13.1), will herald ‘the end of days’. His description as ‘one who will teach righteousness’ draws upon the language and structure of the prophetic expectation in Hosea 10.12 and is, according to our chronological schema, the earliest form to be found in the sectarian literature related to the sobriquet מורה הצדק.

2.2.1.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’

CD 5.20 – 6.2

As already stated, there are no explicit references to ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (מטיף הכוזב) in the pre-Yahadic D-material and equally none of the associated forms that we listed in Chapter One are to be found. However, one related phrase, reminiscent of מטיף הכוזב, appears interestingly enough *immediately* before the passage considered above containing reference to יורה הצדק:

⁵²⁰And at the time of the destruction of the land, there arose those who moved the boundary and led Israel astray {יִתְּעוּ אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל}. ²¹And the land became desolate for they spoke rebellion against the commandments of God by the hand of Moses and also ^{6.1}by the holy anointed ones, and they prophesied falsehood {יִנְבְּאוּ שִׁקְרָה} to turn Israel away from following ²God. (CD 5.20 – 6.2)

This passage (paralleled in 4Q266 frag.3, 2.7-10; 4Q267 frag.2, 4-7; 4Q269 frag.4, 1-3; 6Q15 frag.3, 2-5) refers to those who **נבא שקר**, translated here ‘prophesied falsehood’ (Bowley 1999, p.365; cf. Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).³⁴ This is one of only very few occurrences of the verb **נבא** among the scrolls (see Bowley 1999, p.360; Flint 2005, pp.161-162, 166-167). The word **שקר** denotes ‘lies’ / ‘falsehood’ / ‘deception’ and is thus effectively synonymous in meaning to **כזב** (cf. Koehler and Baumgartner 1995; 1999).³⁵ Indeed, **שקר** and **כזב** appear alongside each other in Micah 2.11 (along with **נטף**), a passage that as we shall see in the following chapter may have some bearing on the development of the sobriquet **מטיף הכזב**.³⁶ It is in order to maintain some distinction between the two that we have here elected to render **שקר** as ‘falsehood’, though the parallel with **כזב** should not be ignored.

The coupling of **נבא** and **שקר** has some scriptural precedence, of which the book of Jeremiah contains several notable examples: e.g. **הנביאים** (23.26); **נבא שקר** (5.31); **הנבאים בשמי שקר** (23.25); **נבא שקר** (23.32). Jeremiah 23 in particular concerns itself with false prophecy and similarly accuses such figures of having led Israel astray (**הטעה**; 23.13, 32; cf. CD 5.20); this against the backdrop of the Babylonian exile and the desolation of the land, a theme that recurs throughout Jeremiah (cf. CD 1.3-8; 3.8-16; 5.20 – 6.5). The employment of **נבא** and **שקר** in this specific scriptural context may suggest that the book of Jeremiah (especially Jeremiah 23) exerted some influence over the shaping of CD 5.20 – 6.2 and the description of those

³⁴ Other translations include: ‘prophesied falsely’ (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983); ‘prophesied lies’ (Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004); ‘prophesied deceit’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

³⁵ Also: Davidson 2002; Holladay 2000.

³⁶ See Bengtsson 2000a, p.97, n.48.

who ינבאו שקר.³⁷ Furthermore, forming a contrast with the false prophets, Jeremiah 23.5-6 reads:

The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous branch {צמח צדיק}, ... (Jeremiah 23.5)

It is interesting to speculate whether this might have had some effect on the pre-Yahadic D-material's reading of Hosea 10.12 or on the subsequent formulation of the messianic יורה הצדק, expected at 'the end of days' (CD 6.11).³⁸

The group portrayed in CD 5.20 – 6.2 as those who ינבאו שקר are described as having arisen 'at the time of the destruction of the land' and are also accused of having 'moved the boundary' (מסיגי הגבול; CD 5.20), 'led Israel astray' (יהעו את ישראל; CD 5.20) and having 'spoke rebellion against the commandments of God' (דברו סרה על מצות אל; CD 5.21).³⁹ They are set in direct opposition to Moses and 'the holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש; CD 6.1) through whom God's commandments have been revealed.⁴⁰ The explicit presentation of the משיחי הקודש as God's true prophets (cf. CD 2.12-13; see Bowley 1999, pp.358-360) unmistakably renders the group who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר; CD 6.1) and 'led Israel astray' in the role of 'false prophets'.⁴¹ The scriptural language employed casts this group in the typological mould of the false prophets spoken of in Jeremiah 23 (cf. Deuteronomy 13). Their prophetic status is thus undermined ('I did not send them or appoint them';

³⁷ So too Campbell (1995a pp.92, 97) and Knibb (1994a pp.46-47). The passage may also echo: Deuteronomy 13.6; 19.14; 27.17; Hosea 5.10; 2 Chronicles 36.15-16 (Campbell 1995a, pp.91-99).

³⁸ Cf. 4Q174 frag.1, 1.11-12; 4Q252 5.1-7. See further, Ulfsgard 2000.

³⁹ Cf. 4Q266 frag.3, 2.7; 4Q266 frag.3, 2.8; 4Q267 frag.2, 5).

⁴⁰ משיחו הקודש corrected from משיחו הקודש, following 4Q267 frag.2, 6; 6Q15 frag.3, 4 (cf. Fitzmyer 2000, pp.88-90; Qimron 1992a; Rabinowitz 1954, p.20, n.41).

⁴¹ On the identification (or self-proclamation) of "charismatic preachers" as prophets and the notion of false prophecy, see Barton 1986, pp.105-116. See further, Bowley 1999; J.J.M. Roberts 1988, pp.216-220. Cf. 4Q339, a list of 'false prophets who arose in Israel' (4Q339 1).

Jeremiah 23.32) and truth is deemed to reside instead in the שְׂבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל and דּוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה described immediately below.

The accusation contained in the phrase יִנְבְּאוּ שִׁקְרָא is evocative of the sobriquet ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ and encapsulates the *sense* of the designation in as much as one labelled a ‘spouter’ / ‘preacher’ of a lie is thus presented in the mould of a false prophet (cf. Micah 2.11).⁴² Davies likewise notes the similarity “in content if not in wording” between יִנְבְּאוּ שִׁקְרָא and מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב, though emphasises the influence of scripture upon the presentation of false prophets in this context (Davies 1983, p.121). Nevertheless, if we were to view the Damascus Document as a unified text and thus attribute this passage to the same layer as those passages which *do* make accusations of ‘spouting lies’ (see Chapter Three), we might consider the failure of CD 5.20 – 6.2 to utilise this typology something of a ‘missed opportunity’. However, construed as a *pre*-Yahadic passage, we may conclude instead that this typology was simply yet to be adopted within sectarian vocabulary. Indeed, the absence of any identifiable form of the designation מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב in the FSL and the consistent use of rather generalised scriptural terms to describe adversaries (e.g. ‘those who moved the boundary’; CD 5.20) might suggest that there was no significant polarised opposition at this point. Perhaps, given that it would appear no ‘teacher’ had yet arisen (cf. CD 6.10-11a), there was equally no specific counter-figure known to this textual layer upon whom some form of the title מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב might be conferred?

2.3. Conclusions

The sobriquets מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב and מוֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק do not occur in the FSL and there is no unequivocal indication that this textual layer is aware of any historical figures to whom these titles might have been applied.⁴³ Instead, with

⁴² Rowley 1958, p.120.

⁴³ It has been suggested by some that מוֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק was an alternative label for the figure deemed דּוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה who *does* appear in the FSL (e.g. Bengtsson 2000a, p.182; Collins 1994a; Knibb

regard to מורה הצדק, we have only an abstract description of a future didactic figure, ‘one who will teach righteousness {יורה הצדק} at the end of days’ (CD 6.11a). A parallel passage (CD 12.23 – 13.1) suggests that this description may have applied to the anticipated (apparently singular) figure elsewhere labelled ‘the messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (משיח אהרן וישראל).⁴⁴ CD 6.10-11a shares terminological, structural and contextual affinities with Hosea 10.12, though (as with later exegetes; see n.15 above) interprets the scriptural text in relation to a ‘teacher’. The roots ירה and צדק, the structure of the phrase יורה עמד יורה, and the context of ‘seeking’ (root: דרש) can all be derived from Hosea 10.12. Thus, the occurrence of יורה הצדק at CD 6.11 can be described as a thoroughly contextualised adoption from the scriptural passage. The precise relationship (if any) between this attestation and the sobriquet מורה הצדק is something that we shall endeavour to explore as we continue our examination of the remaining sectarian textual layers.

Not only is the title מטף הכזב similarly absent from this textual layer, but also any identifiable use of vocabulary that might constitute an antecedent form of the sobriquet. The closest reference, in terms of sense at least, is the description of a group who, among other things, ‘prophesied falsehood’ (נבאו שקר; CD 6.1). The failure of the Damascus Document to utilise a ‘spouting’ typology in this context, as prevalent elsewhere in the (later) text, suggests that this motif was perhaps unknown to the FSL. Indeed, this textual layer attests no counter-figure to the anticipated יורה הצדק. Even the group who ‘prophesied falsehood’ belong to the past-present from the perspective of this passage and so are set in opposition to the prophets of the past, ‘the holy anointed ones’ (CD 6.1), rather than the ‘teacher’.

1990, pp.56-63), though even if the case, the sobriquet itself, מורה הצדק, remains demonstrably absent from this textual layer.

⁴⁴ See n.21 above.

As noted by Michael Knibb, there is a marked dualism in CD 5.16 – 6.11 (1994a, p.46).⁴⁵ ‘The Prince of Lights’ (שֵׁר הָאֹרִים; 5.18) is opposed by ‘Belial’ (בְּלִיעַל; 5.18) while ‘Moses and Aaron’ (מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן; 5.18) have their counterparts in ‘Jannes and his brother’ (יַחְנָה וְאֶת אֶחָיו; 5.18-19).⁴⁶ The ‘men of understanding’ (נְבוֹנִים; 6.2) and ‘men of wisdom’ (חֲכָמִים; 6.3) raised up by God stand in sharp contrast to those described as ‘not a people of understanding’ (לֹא עַם בִּינּוֹת הוּא; 5.16; cf. Isaiah 27.11) and of whom it is said ‘there is no understanding in them’ (אֵין בָּהֶם בִּינָה; 5.17; cf. Deut 32.28). The ‘holy anointed ones’ (מְשִׁיחֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ; 6.1), as true prophets through whom God’s commandments are claimed to have come, are juxtaposed by those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (יִנְבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר; 6.1).⁴⁷

However, the anticipated ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (יֹרֵה; 6.11) has no counterpart and remains, for the purposes of this passage, unopposed. This may indicate that the movement behind the text did not expect there to be any opposition when this eschatological figure arrived, perhaps believing he would be universally recognised. We might posit that only at a later stage, after the arrival of a claimant to the role and in response to those who did not in fact recognise him as such, was it necessary to employ labels denoting opposition.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, the terminology and typological mould for describing these opponents is in place in the FSL. The anticipated ‘teacher’ is presented as an eschatological successor to מְשִׁיחֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ; just as ‘the holy anointed ones’

⁴⁵ Note however that Knibb regards CD 5.17b-19 as secondary (1994a, p.46; so too Murphy-O’Connor 1970, pp.224-225), *contra* Davies (1983, p.121) and Pietersma (1991, p.384; 2000). On dualistic elements in the scrolls and Persian influences, see: Collins 1979; 1995b; Davies 1978; 1985, pp.49-55; Duhaime 2000b; van der Ploeg 1958, pp.95-105; Wilcox 1969.

⁴⁶ Cf. Davies 2000b, p.32, n.6; Pietersma 1991; 2000.

⁴⁷ One glaring omission from this otherwise fairly consistent duality is the absence of any counterpart to ‘the Seeker of the Law’ (דֹּרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה; 6.7). This may have historical implications which could be pursued in a subsequent study.

⁴⁸ This may in turn lend weight to the postulated existence of historical figures behind such epithets.

were the instruments of God's teaching in the past, so the anointed **יורה הצדק** (cf. CD 12.23 – 13.1) will confer God's teaching 'at the end of days' (CD 6.11; cf. Hosea 10.12).⁴⁹ Formulated in this manner, we might suppose that any figure who did later arise in opposition to the 'teacher' would be cast in the mould of those who **ינבאו שקר**, the group that in this passage stands most clearly in contrast to **משיחי הקודש**. In other words if we were to deduce an oppositional designation we would do so in terms of false prophecy. Might we here be able to detect the earliest traces of a dichotomy that was eventually to produce the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie' (**מטיף הכזב**)?

⁴⁹ The passage notes that, during the interim 'age of wickedness', the decrees issued by 'the Seeker of the Law' are to be followed (CD 6.7-11).

3.

Early Sectarian Layer

3.1. Introduction

The second of our proposed textual layers to be examined is the ‘Early Sectarian Layer’. This is the first of two broad textual layers that can perhaps be more readily classed as Yahadic or ‘sectarian’ in the strictest sense.¹ The designation ‘Early Sectarian’ has no specific bearing on the timescale in which these texts were produced and should not be taken to imply, for example, that these texts were all composed within a few years of the establishment of the ‘Yahad’. Neither should it be assumed that the texts contained herein were all produced simultaneously; indeed the period of time covered by this textual layer might be quite extensive.² Instead ‘*Early* Sectarian’ serves only in a relative sense to distinguish these texts from those which, on literary grounds, appear to be dependent upon them and therefore somewhat later (dubbed for our purposes ‘*Late* Sectarian’). In turn, both of these layers postdate the pre-Yahadic ‘*Formative* Sectarian Layer’ examined in the previous chapter.

This Early Sectarian Layer (ESL), in terms of our present investigation, consists chiefly of Yahadic D-material and H-material. As argued in Chapter One, the Damascus Document might primarily be described as a pre-Yahadic text and this informed our adoption of the ‘Formative Sectarian Layer’. Yet, as Philip Davies notes, it is “strictly speaking, also to be regarded as a *yahad* text” (2000b, p.36), as the documents we have constitute a Yahadic revision of the earlier material.³ It is these apparent revisions which comprise the Yahadic D-material

¹ See n.5 of the Introduction.

² This in turn raises the possibility that our approach could be further refined if evidence of textual dependency internal to this layer was discovered. We shall return to this issue in our final Conclusions.

³ See primarily Davies 1983. Cf. Chapter One, n.93.

and will be examined here.⁴ The H-material will likewise be scrutinised for any apparent occurrences of the sobriquets *מטרי הכוזב* and *מורה הצדק* (along with both ‘variant’ forms and related terminology where appropriate). One further text to be examined in the ESL is 4Q252. In Chapter One we tentatively placed this text alongside the D-material (following Campbell 2004, pp.17-18) on the grounds of similarity in terms of language, structure and exegetical method. We furthermore placed it with the specifically Yahadic D-material after noting its use of *אנשי היחיד* (‘the Men of the Community/Yahad’).⁵ Though the text contains no discernible designations related to *מטרי הכוזב*, we shall nevertheless consider what light one passage in particular might throw upon our understanding of the sobriquet *מורה הצדק* before proceeding to the ‘Late Sectarian Layer’. First however, let us turn our attention once more to the Damascus Document.

3.2. Sobriquets in the Early Sectarian Layer

3.2.1. The (Yahadic) Damascus Document

3.2.1.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’

CD 1.4-11a

The first of several possible allusions to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ in the Yahadic revision of the Damascus Document occurs early on in the text in the context of yet another passage that appears to describe the origins of a group:⁶

¹⁴But when he remembered the covenant of the forefathers, he left a remnant ⁵to Israel and did not give them to destruction. And at the time of wrath, *three hundred* ⁶*and ninety years after he had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon,* ⁷he visited them and caused to grow from Israel *and from Aaron* a root of planting to inherit ⁸his land and to grow fat on the goodness of his soil. And they perceived their iniquity

⁴ This Yahadic redaction consists of CD 19.33b – 20.27a, along with the various glosses (e.g. 1.11a; 1.13-18a; 4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14 – 8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a). Note however: Boyce 1990; Campbell 1999; Dimant 1984 (pp.490-497).

⁵ See Chapter One, n.97. So too Brooke 1994b, p.174, n.26; García Martínez 1995b, p.161. Cf. perhaps *אנשי היחיד* (CD 20.32).

⁶ Charlotte Hempel identifies four such passages in the Damascus Document, each constituting an ‘account of community origins’: CD 1.3-11a; 2.8b-13; 3.12b – 4.12a; 5.20 – 6.11a (1999a; also 2000, pp.26-43).

and knew that ⁹they were guilty men, and they were like the blind and like gropers of a way ¹⁰*for twenty years*. But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him {דרשוהו} with a whole heart, ¹¹*and he raised up for them מורה צדק to lead them in the way of his heart.* (CD 1.4-11a)⁷

This passage is paralleled in 4Q266 (frag.2, 1.9-15) and partially in 4Q268 (frag.1, 11-17), though, due to the poor state of preservation, מורה צדק is attested in neither. The text here is instantly reminiscent of CD 6.2-11a, examined in the FSL, and indeed is largely pre-Yahadic itself in terms of content, though ultimately the product of Yahadic revision; as such the passage as a whole has a distinctly Yahadic ‘spin’ to it. The designation מורה צדק would certainly appear to be related in some way to מורה הצדק, and in fact the only notable difference between the two is the absence of the definite article in the former. Sensitive to this omission (and its potential significance), most scholars render the phrase ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (Davies 1983; Knibb 1994a; Schechter 1970; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or with capitals, ‘a Teacher of Righteousness’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004).⁸ Of these two possibilities, this thesis shall adopt the former, leaving the designation un-capitalised (‘a teacher of righteousness’; מורה צדק) so as to distinguish it more obviously in our considerations from the ‘standard’ form title ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה הצדק).⁹

Whence then מורה צדק? Timothy Lim regards it as simply a variant form of מורה הצדק, believing the absence of the definite article to be the result of “the poetic context in which the phrase is found” (Lim 2002, p.75), and thus translates without distinction. Accordingly, he considers the origin of the phrase

⁷ Italics signify the Yahadic glosses or expansions to the text, following Davies 1983 (p.233; cf. pp.61-69). Note however, Wassen 2005, p.33, n.66.

⁸ Cf. ‘a Righteous Teacher’ (J.M. Baumgarten 1996; 2004, p.83). Note however ‘(the) Righteous Teacher’ (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995). Also, ‘a Guide of Righteousness’ (Rabinowitz 1954; 1958).

⁹ See Chapter One, n.54.

to lie in such scriptural passages as Hosea 10.12 and Joel 2.23 (as we examined in the FSL). Of these, Jonathan Campbell regards Hosea 10.12 (in conjunction with Isaiah 30.20) as having some impact upon the formation of **מורה צדק** in CD 1.11 (1995a, pp.51-67).¹⁰ It is perhaps worth re-examining this scriptural passage:

Sow for yourselves righteousness; reap steadfast love; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek {דרוש} the LORD, that he may come {עד-יבוא} and rain righteousness {ירה צדק} upon you. (Hosea 10.12)

As was the case with CD 6.2-11a, there are likewise some significant parallels between this passage and CD 1.4-11a. In both cases the ‘raining of righteousness’ or the arrival of ‘a teacher of righteousness’ is at the instigation of God and in direct response to the act of seeking him (cf. CD 1.10: **דרשוהו**). It might even be possible that the planting metaphor of Hosea 10.12a consequently influenced the inclusion of such in CD 1.7 (the specific formation of which was perhaps more heavily influenced by Isaiah 60.21; cf. Campbell 1995a, pp.56, 61-62).¹¹

There are without doubt therefore some notable parallels between Hosea 10.12 and CD 1.4-11a, though it is significant that by and large these are the same parallels as occur between the former and CD 6.2-11a. In the FSL we noted the striking similarity between the phrases **עד-יבוא וירה צדק** (Hosea 10.12) and **עד עמד יורה הצדק** (CD 6.10-11), both events occurring as a consequence of ‘seeking’ God (cf. CD 6.6-7: **כי דרשוהו**). This parallel is arguably stronger, for example in terms of such phraseology, than that between Hosea 10.12 and CD 1.4-11a (the final form of which has already been allocated on other grounds to a later textual layer than CD 6.2-11a).¹² Might the Yahadic redaction of CD 1.4-11a therefore be dependent only vicariously upon Hosea 10.12 through an actual dependence upon CD 6.2-11a? Furthermore, according to the schema we have

¹⁰ So too Schechter 1970, p.63, n.16.

¹¹ Campbell also notes the occurrence of **טוב הצואר** a little further down the column (CD 1.19) which, being paralleled in Hosea 10.11, would appear to corroborate the influence of this text on the passage in question (Campbell 1995a, p.62).

¹² Cf. Davies 1983.

adopted from Davies, the act of seeking in CD 1.10 (דרשוהו), the planting metaphor of CD 1.7 and the occurrence of טוב הצואר at CD 1.19 all belong to the original pre-Yahadic text, while God's raising of 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק; CD 1.11) is a Yahadic expansion.¹³ To what extent therefore can we really regard Hosea 10.12 itself as having influenced the formation of מורה צדק in this passage? Rather, it is over the pre-Yahadic text of the Damascus Document that the scriptural passage appears to have exerted its greatest influence.

In the absence of any other explanation we might consider the various apparent parallels with Hosea 10.11-12 as evidence of the textual unity of CD 1.4-11a (or at least of the originality of CD 1.11a), thus casting doubt upon the assertions of Davies and others that the passage has undergone a Yahadic revision.¹⁴ However, the other possibility, as noted above, is that CD 1.4-11a in its final form might be dependent upon CD 6.2-11a. The *pre*-Yahadic elements of the first column (דרשוהו; טוב הצואר; etc) may still have been influenced by Hosea 10 (as identified by Campbell; 1995a, pp.51-67), while the later Yahadic expansion of CD 1.11a might have been fashioned *post factum* in accordance with the expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness' (יורה הצדק) professed in CD 6.10-11a, itself directly dependent upon Hosea 10.12.

The מורה צדק of CD 1.11a is generally interpreted by most scholars as referring in some way to the same historical figure elsewhere given the title מורה הצדק.¹⁵ The historical question aside, there does indeed appear to be some relation between the two designations on account of their remarkable similarity. Given the absence of the 'standard' form title מורה הצדק in the

¹³ Davies 1983, p.233; cf. pp.61-69.

¹⁴ The various scholarly arguments for the existence of such a revision of this passage are summarised in Davies 1983, pp.61-69.

¹⁵ See for example: Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Charlesworth 2002; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Grossman 2002; Hempel 1999a; Knibb 1994a; Lim 2002; Murphy-O'Connor 1974; Puech 1999; Schiffman 1994; Stegemann 1992; VanderKam 1994a; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996.

ESL, might מורה צדק represent not a variant (as Lim 2002, p.75) but a developmental stage of the sobriquet, perhaps prior to such apparent standardisation? With the adoption of Davies' interpretation of the Damascus Document, specifically the proposal that the expectation of יורה הצדק (CD 6.10-11a) pre-dates the Yahadic assertion of a מורה צדק (CD 1.11a), it becomes increasingly probable that the formulation (and insertion) of the latter was *primarily* dependent upon the existence of the former passage already within the pre-Yahadic form of the text. An association of CD 1.11a with Hosea 10.12 comes vicariously therefore through CD 6.2-11a and also through the apparent influence of Hosea 10 upon the pre-Yahadic context in which CD 1.11a is set (itself perhaps the reason for the inclusion of מורה צדק at this point).¹⁶ That the figure raised up by God is described as 'a teacher of righteousness' owes more perhaps to the pre-existing expectation that there would arise 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (itself an interpretation of the raining of righteousness in Hosea 10.12), than the scriptural text on which this expectation was based.

The use of the past tense in CD 1.4-11a implies that a figure described as 'a teacher of righteousness' had already arisen by the time of this Yahadic revision of the text. The association of this description with (and probable dependence upon) יורה הצדק of CD 6.10-11a suggests that the figure thus described was held (at least in some circles) to be the 'one who will teach righteousness' expected 'at the end of days'. Two further implications therefore become apparent. Firstly, those who subscribed to such an opinion may well have

¹⁶ We are given perhaps to wonder whether, prior to Yahadic revision, CD 1.4-11a may have contained at this point an expectation akin to that of the יורה הצדק of CD 6.10-11a. If the case, the poetical metre of the passage, upon which Mark Boyce bases his arguments in favour of textual unity and the originality of CD 1.11a (Boyce 1990), might not have been so different in the pre-Yahadic stage. However, such would raise the question as to why an appropriate revision was not also made of CD 6.10-11a; a point noted by Campbell (1995a, p.90, n.71; 1999, pp.17-22) and which we shall discuss further in Chapter Five. Furthermore, it is arguable on specifically metrical grounds that CD 1.11a constitutes an insertion into the text rather than a replacement (e.g. Davies 1983, pp.61-69).

believed themselves to be living in ‘the end of days’ (cf. CD 6.10-11a).¹⁷ Secondly, we noted in Chapter Two that **יורה הצדק באחרית הימים** (CD 6.11a) appears to be a description of the anticipated ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (cf. CD 12.23 – 13.1); might we then infer that the figure acclaimed as **מורה צדק** in CD 1.11a was regarded in this messianic light? In terms of the historical question, Davies goes so far as to suggest that such (loosely defined) “messianic pretension” may provide the key to understanding the origins of the Yahad and its point of departure from the wider movement responsible for the pre-Yahadic material (Davies 1988, pp.316-317; cf. 1996, pp.92-94).¹⁸

With regard to context, this figure is explicitly described as having been ‘raised up’ for a pre-existing group who were ‘like the blind and like gropers of a way *for twenty years*’ prior to his arrival (CD 1.9-11). It would be consistent with our interpretation of the text so far to identify this group with that described in CD 6.2-11a as following the decrees issued for the interim period by ‘the Seeker of the Law’ while awaiting the arrival of ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’. Specifically, from the point of view of the (post- **מורה צדק**) Yahadic revision of the text, this unenlightened group represents the pre-Yahadic movement responsible for the earliest form of the text; by implication, any of this number who failed to acknowledge the figure acclaimed by the Yahad as **מורה צדק** (the time of whose arrival is clearly denoted) remain ‘like the blind and like gropers of a way’.

In the pre-Yahadic Damascus Document, the terms ‘remnant’ (**שארית**; CD 1.4) and ‘a root of planting’ (**שורש מטעה**; CD 1.7) appear to be

¹⁷ Note the insight of Davies with regard to the expectation of **יורה הצדק** and its relation to **אחרית הימים** in CD 6.2-11a: “The ‘end of days’ might signify the arrival of the Teacher: more pertinently, *the arrival of the Teacher would signify the ‘end of days’*” (Davies 1988, p.315; cf. 1996, p.91). Cf. 4Q398 frags 11-13, 4: **וזה הוא אחרית הימים**.

¹⁸ Difference of opinion regarding the authority of the ‘teacher’ has also been suggested by other scholars as a defining factor in the shaping of the Yahad; see for example: Charlesworth 2002, p.36; Murphy-O’Connor 1974, pp.233-238; VanderKam 1994a, pp.100-101; 1999a, p.527; Vermes 2004, pp.54-66.

synonymous self-descriptions of the group responsible for the text.¹⁹ The Yahadic redaction however, in particular the insertion of the phrase ‘three hundred and ninety years after he had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon’ (CD 1.5-6), results in the chronological distancing of the ‘remnant’ and the ‘root’, with the latter now appearing to designate a later group that sprang from the former. Accordingly, we should perhaps recognise the term ‘a root of planting’ as having been specifically adopted as a self-identification of the Yahad, a group from within the ‘remnant’ who, after a shared period of groping for the way (cf. 4Q306 frag.1, 12), acknowledged the arrival of one acclaimed as the anticipated *יורה הצדק* of CD 6.11a.²⁰ Such a shift in the self-identification of the group responsible for the text as we have it is also evidenced by Charlotte Hempel’s examination of ‘accounts of community origins’ in the Damascus Document. She claims that these accounts:

convey a sense of temporal distance and remoteness of the writer(s) from the beginnings of the movement. One gains the impression that the writer(s) of these passages *no longer identify with the beginnings of the movement* but are very conscious of a considerable period of time having elapsed. (Hempel 1999a, pp.327-328; my italics)

As already stated, we may make an educated guess, based on the content of the Yahadic redaction of the text, that the point of departure was the arrival of a figure who was acclaimed by some as the messianic ‘one who will teach righteousness’ anticipated in CD 6.10-11a.²¹ It is then the conviction of the

¹⁹ So too Davies 1983, p.65. On the use of the planting metaphor elsewhere among Jewish literature, see: Fujita 1976; Stuckenbruck 2005; Tiller 1997. Shozo Fujita notes the relationship in such literature between the planting metaphor and the existence of a ‘righteous remnant’ consisting of pious Jews who, in the aftermath of a period of wickedness, ‘repent and return to God’ (1976, p.39). There is a clear similarity with the ‘remnant’ / ‘root of planting’ group of the Damascus Document who, existing in the ‘time of wrath’ (CD 1.4-8), are elsewhere in the text described as the *שבי ישראל* (CD 4.2; 6.5; 8.16; 19.29). This leads Hempel to conclude that such texts (for example, Jubilees and 1 Enoch) were actually composed by the same group as that responsible for the Damascus Document (1999a, p.329, n.36).

²⁰ Phillip Callaway has similarly identified the ‘remnant’ with the (pre-Yahadic) *שבי ישראל* who followed the decrees laid down by ‘the Seeker of the Law’ while awaiting the arrival of ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’. The ‘root of planting’ on the other hand, in the present form of the text at least, is taken to designate the (Yahadic) group who acknowledged the historical arrival of ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (*מורה צדק*; CD 1.11a). See Callaway 1990.

²¹ Cf. Davies 1988, p.316.

Yahadic group that the *יורה הצדק* had indeed arrived (in the face of opposition from other members of the ‘remnant’ group) that caused this separation of ‘remnant’ and ‘root of planting’ in the ideology of the Yahad. Furthermore, it is this conviction that is directly responsible for the shaping of the designation *מורה צדק* (‘a teacher of righteousness’) in reference to this figure. In this sense, the formulation of *מורה צדק* (CD 1.11a) from *יורה הצדק* (CD 6.11a) can be viewed in a polemical light, aimed at establishing categorically the identity of this figure according to the understanding of the Yahadic group.

CD 19.33b – 20.1a

Though no further instances of ‘teacher’ designations occur within manuscript A of the Cairo Damascus Document (save *יורה הצדק* at CD 6.11a, belonging to the FSL), several are to be found in manuscript B. The last line of column 19 preserves the words *יור* and *מורה* (CD 19.35), though a horizontal line crossing them indicates a cancellation.²² The resulting passage reads:

^{19.33}Thus all the men who entered the new ³⁴covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living water ³⁵shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written from the day of the gathering in {האסר} of *מורה היחיד*^{20.1} until there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel. (CD 19.33b – 20.1a)

The meaning of the designation *מורה היחיד* is uncertain. Solomon Schechter rendered it ‘the only teacher’, taking *היחיד* as a subjective genitive derived from *יחיד* meaning ‘only’ (cf. Genesis 22.2).²³ His approach has been followed by several scholars who have translated the phrase similarly as ‘the unique teacher’ (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997). However, further down the same column, CD 20.31-32 reads:

²² Qimron 1992a, pp.44-45; Schechter 1970, p.75, n.24. For the use of similar correction procedures among the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls, see Tov 1999 (esp. p.251).

²³ Schechter 1970, p.75.

^{20,31}and have been instructed in the first ordinances by which אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְּחִיד³² were judged (CD 20.31-32).

An intriguing parallel exists in the Community Rule:

and they shall be judged by the first ordinances in which אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְּחִיד began to be instructed (1QS 9.10).

This suggests that הַיְּחִיד might be a variant form of הַיְּחִיד ('the Yahad / Community'), in which case אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְּחִיד could likewise be rendered 'the Men of the Community'.²⁴ Furthermore, it would follow that הַיְּחִיד, taken as an objective genitive in this way, would render מוֹרֶה הַיְּחִיד 'the Teacher of the Community' (Davies 1983; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004).²⁵ Unfortunately we have only the medieval manuscript B of the Damascus Document upon which to found any assumptions as the passage is not paralleled among the fragmentary Qumran-related material. Nevertheless we shall follow the majority of scholars in rendering אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְּחִיד 'the Men of the Community' and thus, adopting a consistent approach that regards הַיְּחִיד as a variant form of הַיְּחִיד, render מוֹרֶה הַיְּחִיד 'the Teacher of the Community'.²⁶

What then is the nature of this relationship between the sobriquet מוֹרֶה הַיְּחִיד and the other 'teacher' designations? Like מוֹרֶה צֶדֶק of CD 1.11a,

²⁴ Indeed, Elisha Qimron notes in his transcription of CD to read הַיְּחִיד for הַיְּחִיד (1992a, pp.46-49). So too Eduard Lohse (1981, pp.104-107). See further, de Moor 1957. Cf. Clines (ed.) 1998; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

²⁵ It is intriguing that Baumgarten and Schwartz render מוֹרֶה הַיְּחִיד 'the unique Teacher', yet translate אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְּחִיד a few lines later as 'the men of the Community' (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995). In similar fashion, Wise, Abegg and Cook refer to 'the Beloved Teacher' and 'the members of the *Yahad*' respectively (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Such an approach appears to be fundamentally inconsistent.

²⁶ Likewise, Brownlee 1979, p.48; Cross 1995, pp.73, 118; Davies 1983; Eshel 1999a; Fitzmyer 2000, p.91; Fröhlich 1999, p.296, n.8; Knibb 1994a; Lohse 1981; Qimron 1992a; Roth 1963, p.95, n.1; Rowley 1952a, p.32, n.5; Stern 1950, p.24; Talmon 1953; 1989, pp.53-60, 289; Vermes 2004; Wernberg-Møller 1953, p.311-312.

מורה היחיד would appear to describe a figure that has already arisen.²⁷ Rather than posit the existence of two historical teachers, ‘the Teacher of the Community’ may refer to the same figure elsewhere described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’.²⁸ In our examination above, we concluded that מורה צדק in CD 1.11a was acclaimed as the ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (‘יורה הצדק’) anticipated ‘at the end of days’ in the FSL (CD 6.10-11a). We can therefore further conclude, at least tentatively, that this figure was given the titular designation ‘the Teacher of the Community’.²⁹

The passage mentions ‘the day of the gathering in {האסף} of the Teacher of the Community’ (CD 19.35b – 20.1a), generally accepted as a reference to his death.³⁰ Although Ben Zion Wacholder has argued that this refers to “the assembling of the community by the Moreh” (1988, p.327), his approach has more recently been refuted by Joseph Fitzmyer who demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that the death of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ is here indicated (2000, pp.261-265). From this point until the arrival of ‘the messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ (משיח מאהרן ומישראל; CD 20.1a):

^{19.33}all the men who entered the new ³⁴covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living water ³⁵shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written (CD 19.33b-35).

Why should the death of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ provide such a starting point? Perhaps it was considered that, with his death, there no longer existed the authority to allow re-admission (e.g. Murphy-O’Connor 1972, p.546). Alternatively, perhaps it was his death itself that triggered this departure from the

²⁷ Cf. however Wiesenberg 1955, pp.306-308.

²⁸ So too most scholars; see for example n.26 above. Note however Roth (1963, p.95, n.1) and Wiesenberg (1955).

²⁹ Of course one potential problem with such an assessment is that we have already identified ‘יורה הצדק’ with ‘the messiah of Aaron and Israel’, whereas in CD 19.33b – 20.1a ‘the Teacher of the Community’ is quite clearly distinct from משיח מאהרן ומישראל. We shall use the remainder of this section to explore this issue.

³⁰ Cf. Genesis 25.8, 17; Numbers 20.24-26; 2 Kings 22.20.

‘new covenant’ and its ‘well of living water’ (cf. CD 3.12b-16; 6.2-5)? We earlier hypothesised that the pre-Yahadic expectation of ‘the messiah of Aaron and Israel’ as ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23 – 13.1) was deemed to have been fulfilled by the arrival of a figure acclaimed as such and described in these terms (e.g. מורה צדק; CD 1.11a). His death, and the understandable disappointment that would ensue for those whose messianic hopes were pinned upon him, may have prompted some to depart from the group, thus betraying the covenant in the eyes of those who remained steadfast.³¹

Whatever the circumstances, the death of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ appears to have necessitated an amendment of the Yahad’s messianic expectations. While in the FSL, the pre-Yahadic layer of the Damascus Document, a ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ is anticipated as ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23 – 13.1), here the death of the figure to whom these descriptions were apparently applied results in the separation of the messianic and teacher roles. Though ‘the Teacher of the Community’ is dead, the ‘messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ (משיח מאהרן) (ומישראל; CD 20.1a) is still to come. In this context perhaps we might draw upon two passages that constitute part of the overlap between manuscripts A and B of the Cairo Damascus Document (CD 7.18 – 8.1; 19.10-11):

^{7.18}And the ‘star’ is דורש התורה, ¹⁹who came {הבא} to Damascus, as it is written: “A star shall come forth from Jacob and a staff shall arise ²⁰from Israel”. The ‘staff’ is משיח כל העדה and when he arises he will destroy ²¹all the sons of Seth. These escaped

³¹ Davies responds to the passage differently. Taking the ‘new covenant’ as a gloss on the existing (old) covenant of the pre-Yahadic movement, he argues that those originally addressed here were members of the wider movement who did not accept the authority of ‘the Teacher’; it is only with the addition of the gloss that the passage (wrongly?) suggests that defectors from the Yahad are addressed (Davies 1983, pp.176-181). The argument is certainly persuasive. However, Davies himself notes “the fact that ‘new covenant’ is a gloss on ‘covenant in the land of Damascus’ at XX, 12 shows that at one point the older terminology persisted” (1983, p.177). In other words, the Yahad believed themselves to be the true continuation of the (old) ‘covenant in the land of Damascus’ (the gloss ‘new’ becoming necessary only at a later stage in order to distinguish themselves from the still existing wider movement). Therefore it is possible that, even without the gloss, the reference to ‘the covenant in the land of Damascus’ might still here have referred to the Yahad.

at the time of the first visitation^{8.1} but those who drew back were delivered to the sword. (CD 7.18 – 8.1)

^{19.10}These will escape at the time of the visitation but those who remain will be delivered to the sword when there comes משיח ייאהרן וישראל (CD 19.10-11)

It would appear that CD 7.18 – 8.1 is the later of the two and indeed for Davies constitutes a Yahadic revision of the passage (Davies 1983, pp.250-253).³² We can discern two distinct messianic perspectives. The earliest (pre-Yahadic) layer, taking CD 19.10-11 in conjunction with 6.10-11 and 12.23 – 13.1, looks forward to an upcoming ‘visitation’ and awaits the arrival of ‘the messiah of Aaron and Israel’ who ‘will teach righteousness at the end of days’. The Yahadic layer however knows of a ‘first visitation’ (and accordingly transfers the sentence into the past tense), reveres ‘the Teacher of the Community’ who has died and awaits the arrival of ‘the messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ who is perhaps to be identified with ‘the Prince of all the Congregation’ (cf. CD 7.20-21; 20.1a). This latter figure is juxtaposed in CD 7.18 – 8.1 with ‘the Seeker of the Law’. The דורש התורה ‘who came to Damascus’ represents the movement’s origins (cf. CD 6.2-11a) while ‘the Prince of all the Congregation’ appears to represent the Yahad’s renewed messianic eschatological expectations.³³ The occasion for such a renewal would appear on the strength of our analysis to be the death of the one

³² That the Zechariah-Ezekiel midrash found in CD 19.10-11 is earlier than the Amos-Numbers midrash of 7.18 – 8.1 has been argued by several prominent scholars; see: Brooke 1980 (cf. 1991a); Davies 1983; 1987; 2000c; Knibb 1991; (originally) Murphy-O’Connor 1971a; 1971b; Wise 1999, pp.323-324, n.9. For the opposite interpretation of the text, see Murphy-O’Connor 1985; cf. Grossman 2002, pp.159-160. Note further, White Crawford 1987. The scholarly debate is summarised in Wassen 2005, p.20, n.5.

³³ On understanding דמשיק הבא as a reference to the *past* arrival of דורש התורה, see: Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983, p.147; 2000c; Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.134; Murphy-O’Connor 1985, p.242. However, הבא may also indicate a future event (so Brooke 1980; Collins 1994a; Knibb 1991; Vermes 2004). The depiction of דורש התורה as a figure of the past in CD 6.2-11a would lend weight to the former interpretation. Nevertheless, as Brooke astutely observes, “by taking into account the redactional history of the Damascus Document both scholarly interpretations might be seen to be correct” (1991a, p.225). In other words, the very ambiguity of this phrase may have given rise to an alternative reading within the community, reinterpreting דורש התורה as an eschatological figure. In this context, note 4Q174 frag.1, 1.11-13 (cf. 1QS 9.11).

in whom the group's messianic hopes had been invested, 'the Teacher of the Community'.³⁴

CD 20.13-15

An apparent further reference to this figure appears at CD 20.13-15:

^{20.13} And from the day of ¹⁴the gathering in {האסף} of יורה היחיד until the end of all the Men of War who turned back ¹⁵with איש הכוזב there will be about forty years. (CD 20.13-15)

The form יורה היחיד is reminiscent of יורה הצדק (6.11a) and it is tempting to think it might deliberately echo this scripturally-loaded 'original' expectation.³⁵ There is uncommon unanimity in translating יורה היחיד in identical fashion to מורה היחיד, regarding יורה as either nominal or an error for מורה.³⁶ Thus we have here another reference to 'the day of the gathering in of the Teacher of the Community' (cf. CD 19.35 – 20.1). This sobriquet appears to borrow directly from the pre-Yahadic expectation of יורה הצדק in the FSL with regard to the prominence of a didactic role. The preservation of יורה / מורה in the ESL can

³⁴ For a detailed overview of messianism in the scrolls, see: Collins 1994b; 1995a; Duhaime 2000a; García Martínez 1995b; Knibb 1999; VanderKam 1994b. On shifting messianic perspectives, Davies rightly notes: "the utter unlikelihood of any group's sustaining such expectation in an unaltered form over two hundred years. Even the Christian church was unable to sustain its eschatological fervor for more than a few decades without encountering the need for reformulation. Some kind of cognitive dissonance...surely has to be reckoned with" (1985, p.42). See further, Esler and Hagedorn 2005, pp.28-29; Rodd 1981.

³⁵ For the reading יורה היחיד, see: Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Lohse 1981; Qimron 1992a. Cf. however, יוריה היחיד (Schechter 1970, pp.76, 100; followed by Davies 1983, p.262).

³⁶ Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Schechter 1970; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Of course, this raises the possibility that יורה הצדק (CD 6.11) should be more accurately regarded a variant of מורה הצדק (cf. Rabinowitz 1958, p.393). However, while certainly possible that such was the understanding, the context is nevertheless clearly orientated towards the future ('until there shall arise'; 6.10); the figure designated יורה הצדק has not yet arrived (as opposed to יורה היחיד who is a figure of the past in CD 20.13-15). We are therefore correct to ascribe CD 6.11 to the FSL (assuming both labels to refer to the same 'teacher') and, while it *may* be read as an expectation of 'the Teacher of Righteousness at the end of days' (cf. Dupont-Sommer 1961; Schechter 1970), we shall maintain our original rendering 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days'. Note Davies 1988, p.313.

be seen to hark back to the expectation of a ‘teacher’ in the earliest layer of the text. Thus, as a label, **יורה היחיד** / **מורה** functions in such a way as to echo the role prescribed in CD 6.10-11a; by utilising the capacity of ‘teacher’, it makes the implicit claim that the figure so labelled is indeed the anticipated **יורה הצדק**. This is made all the more clear by the explicit description of this figure elsewhere in the text as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (**מורה צדק**; CD 1.11).

As with CD 19.33b – 20.1a, the death of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ in 20.13-15 signals the start of a specified period of time. In the former, the period will end with the arrival of ‘the messiah from Aaron and from Israel’. In the latter, the period will last ‘until the end of all the Men of War who turned back with **איש הכוזב**’ and will be ‘about forty years’ in length. The repetition of the formula ‘from the day of the gathering in of the Teacher of the Community until’ suggests the possibility at least that the same period is here referred to; in other words that the renewed messianic expectations of the group envisaged the arrival of ‘the messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ within about forty years of the death of the ‘teacher’ (Callaway 1988, pp.111-112; Vermes 2004, pp.58-59; Wiesenbergs 1955, pp.305-306). Campbell notes the influence of Deuteronomy 2.14 upon both the proposed timeframe and the reference to the impending end of ‘all the Men of War’ (1995a, pp.161-171; cf. Steudel 1993, p.238).³⁷ The ‘cognitive dissonance’ resulting from the death of one who had perhaps been perceived as the expected ‘messiah of Aaron and Israel’ (cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23 – 13.1) is tackled by the use of scriptural terms, likening the group to the generation in the wilderness who had to wait until the faithless **אנשי המלחמה** among them had perished before God would fulfil his promise and allow them to occupy the land (cf. Deuteronomy 1.35; 2.7; 2.14).³⁸ This affords us a glimpse of the self-understanding of the group and the mould in which they perceived themselves to be cast.

³⁷ Also, Numbers 14.32-34? Cf. Eshel 1999a.

³⁸ See further, Davies 1983, pp.187-188.

CD 20.27-34

The final passage from the Yahadic recension of the Damascus Document to contain relevant terminology is CD 20.27-34:

^{20.27}But all who hold fast to these ordinances, to go out ²⁸and to come in according to הַחֹרֶה and listen to the voice of מוֹרֶה, and confess before God “We have sinned, ²⁹we have done wickedly, both we and our fathers, in walking contrary to the decrees of the covenant, ³⁰and true are your judgements against us”, and do not raise a hand against his holy decrees and righteous ³¹ordinances and true testimonies, and have been instructed in the first ordinances by which אֲנָשִׁי הַיְחִיד ³²were judged, and listened to the voice of מוֹרֶה צֶדֶק, and do not reject ³³the decrees of righteousness when they hear them, these will rejoice and be glad, and their heart will be strong, and they will prevail ³⁴over all the sons of the world, and God will atone for them and they will see his salvation for they have taken refuge in his holy name. (CD 20.27-34)

In contrast to those groups who are perceived to have in one form or another rejected the covenant and will be punished accordingly (CD 20.8b-20.27), this passage lists the various attainments by which those true to the covenant will be recognised and thus ‘prevail over all the sons of the world’ (CD 20.33-34). Among these feature adherence to הַחֹרֶה (the ‘well’ of CD 6.2-11a; cf. Num 21.18) and instruction in ‘the first ordinances by which אֲנָשִׁי הַיְחִיד were judged’ (cf. 1QS 9.10). More interestingly for our purposes, significant import is attached to ‘the voice of a teacher {מוֹרֶה}’ (CD 20.28) or ‘the voice of a teacher of righteousness {מוֹרֶה צֶדֶק}’ (CD 20.32). We might justly assume that the same figure is here referred to rather than posit two teachers whose voices must be listened to, though of course the possibility cannot be entirely discounted.³⁹ That this prominent authority’s role is described as that of מוֹרֶה once again harks back to the FSL and its expectation of יוֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק (CD 6.10-11a). Such an identification is made explicit by the further description of this figure as מוֹרֶה צֶדֶק (CD 20.32; cf. 1.10-11a). In other words, the labels used to describe this

³⁹ For example, Jerome Murphy-O’Connor argues that מוֹרֶה (CD 20.28) should be understood as a reference to God, while he considers מוֹרֶה צֶדֶק (20.32) to refer to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (1972, p.559). However, Davies regards his interpretation as “improbable” (1983, p.195).

figure deliberately echo the language of CD 6.10-11a in such a way as to both imply and on occasion make explicit that the ‘teacher’ whose voice must be listened to is in fact the one who has been expected; the group’s conviction that the anticipated **יורה הצדק** had indeed arrived is therefore demonstrated and reinforced through the labels they attach to him.

Further examples of this persuasive use of language come from a comparison of this passage with that examined in the pre-Yahadic layer of the text (CD 6.2-11a). The present passage advocates stringent adherence to **התורה**. If we are right in assuming that in the context of the Damascus Document at least this is synonymous with the ‘well’ of CD 6.2-11a (cf. Num 21.18), then while others have ‘departed from the well of living water’ (CD 19.33b-35) the group considers itself to be the true inheritors of this ‘well’ dug by the **שבי ישראל**. They perceive themselves therefore as the legitimate continuation of the original pre-Yahadic group, one defining characteristic being their recognition that the **יורה הצדק** has arrived.⁴⁰ Such a claim is perhaps also to be recognised more subtly in the insistence of the present passage that those here blessed ‘do not reject the decrees of righteousness {**חקי הצדק**} when they hear them’ (CD 20.32-33). This brings to mind the decrees issued by ‘the Seeker of the Law’ to be followed for the interim period until the arrival of **יורה הצדק באחרית הימים**:

^{6,8}And the ‘nobles of the people’ are ⁹those who come to excavate the ‘well’ with the sceptres {/decrees; **מחוקקות**} which ‘the sceptre’ decreed {**חקק**} ¹⁰to walk in during all the age of wickedness (...), until there shall arise ¹¹one who will teach righteousness at the end of days. (CD 6.8-11a)

The clear implication of the passage is that the decrees issued by ‘the Seeker of the Law’ are valid only for ‘the age of wickedness’ and may be abrogated by those issued by the **יורה הצדק** at ‘the end of days’. Acceptance of both the arrival of such ‘a teacher of righteousness’ and the authority of his voice go hand

⁴⁰ See n.31 above.

in hand with accepting both his abrogation of the previous decrees and their replacement (or supplementation) with his own. Perhaps in this light we can better understand the reference to ‘the decrees of righteousness’ (חֲקֵי הַצְדָּקָה) in CD 20.32-33. Thus, those who will ‘prevail over all the sons of the world’ (CD 20.33-34) are those who ‘listened to the voice of a teacher of righteousness, and do not reject the decrees of righteousness when they hear them’ (CD 20.32-33); once again, the crux of the message is that the מוֹרֶה הַצְדָּקָה has arrived.⁴¹

Though it is unclear from this passage whether the ‘teacher’ whose authority carries such weight is alive or dead, if taken with the rest of our analysis of the ESL of the Damascus Document it would appear likely that *continued adherence to his teaching after his death* is here referred to (cf. CD 1.10-11a; 19.33b – 20.1a; 20.13-15). That ‘the voice of a teacher of righteousness’ continued to be authoritative even after his death is significant as it indicates that, despite the need for renewed messianic expectations reinterpreting the arrival of ‘the messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ as an event yet to happen (cf. CD 19.35 – 20.1a), fidelity to the ‘teacher’ and the maintenance of his decrees remained a central qualification for membership of the group.

Summary

Though the sobriquet מוֹרֶה הַצְדָּקָה does not occur in the Damascus Document, it would appear that some development of related terms can indeed be traced. The pre-Yahadic expectation of ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (יֹרֵה הַצְדָּקָה; itself a designation drawn from an interpretation of Hosea 10.12) is deliberately echoed in the ESL labels applied to a figure who was held to fulfil this role. He is described as both ‘a teacher’ (מֹרֶה; CD 20.28) and, in more definite terms, as ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (יֹרֵה הַיְּחִידָה / מֹרֶה; CD 20.1; 20.14). It is his description twice-over as ‘a teacher of righteousness’

⁴¹ In this context, we might understand ‘the first ordinances’ (CD 20.31) to refer to the original decrees issued by ‘the Seeker of the Law’ and now supplemented by ‘the decrees of righteousness’ (CD 20.33); cf. Davies 1983, p.197.

(מורה צדק; CD 1.11; 20.32) however that draws most clearly in form upon the pre-Yahadic expectation and, in doing so, claims the fulfilment of the anticipated role.⁴² This, which we might view in a polemical light (establishing in unambiguous terms the perceived identity of the so-called ‘teacher’ in the face of opposition), may go someway towards explaining the prominence elsewhere of what has come to be regarded as the ‘standard’ form, מורה הצדק.

3.2.1.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’

CD 1.10-18a

The Yahadic recension of the Damascus Document contains several instances of terminology relevant to our examination of the sobriquet מטִיף הכֹּזֵב. The first of these passages appears immediately after the reference to מורה צדק in the first column of CD:

^{1.10}But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him {דרשוהו} with a whole heart,
¹¹and he raised up for them מורה צדק to lead them in the way of his heart. And he made known ¹²to later generations what he had done to the last generation, a congregation of traitors. ¹³They are those who departed from the way. That was the time about which it is written, “like a stray heifer, ¹⁴so Israel strayed”, when arose אִישׁ הלִצְנוֹן who spouted to Israel ¹⁵waters of a lie {דמִיף לִישְׂרָאֵל כֹּזֵב} and led them astray in a wilderness without a way, to bring low the everlasting heights and depart ¹⁶from the paths of righteousness and to remove the boundary which the forefathers had established in their inheritance, in order that ¹⁷the curses of his covenant would cling to them, delivering them to the avenging sword of the vengeance of the ¹⁸covenant. (CD 1.10-18a)⁴³

This passage is paralleled in 4Q266 (frag.2, 1.14-21) where the designation אִישׁ הלִצְנוֹן is partially attested. This would appear to be most suitably rendered ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (cf. Davies 1983; Schechter 1970) and occurs only once in

⁴² Indeed Bengtsson suggests that: “It can be assumed that at the time of the composition of the CD, there was no unified way of referring to the person we know as the Teacher” (2000a, p.193). The consistently definite usage of מורה / יורה היחיד (CD 20.1; 20.14) however and its similarity in form to the ‘standard’ מורה הצדק, might suggest that if the ‘teacher’ was known by any specific title in the Yahadic recension of the Damascus Document it was ‘the Teacher of the Community’. See Chapter One, n.54.

⁴³ Italics signify the Yahadic glosses or expansions to the text, following Davies 1983 (pp.232-235; cf. pp.61-72).

the Damascus Document (though note the plural, **אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן**, in CD 20.11).⁴⁴ According to Campbell, the designation itself stems from a reference to ‘men of scoffing’ (**אֲנָשֵׁי לְצוֹן**) in Isaiah 28.14 (cf. v.22).⁴⁵ These are described as being in a position of authority in Jerusalem and having taken refuge in lies (**כֶּזֶב**) and falsehood (**שִׁקְרָא**). The figure designated ‘the Man of Scoffing’ in the Damascus Document would presumably therefore, according to Campbell’s analysis, encapsulate in a singular form the accusations levelled more generally at the **אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן** of Isaiah 28.14. In this context it is interesting to note that he is accused of having ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ (**הִטִּיף לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִיְמֵי כֶזֶב**; CD 1.14-15), a phrase that contains in some form both elements of the sobriquet **מִטִּיף הַכֶּזֶב**. The metaphorical usage of ‘waters of a lie’ plays on the dual understanding of **נָטַף** as both ‘to spout / drip’ and ‘to preach’, and is reminiscent of the same duality with regard to **יָרָה** in reference to ‘raining’ or ‘teaching’.⁴⁶ The proximity of these two terms in the first column of CD ensures that the one who arose and ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ (CD 1.14-15) is set in sharp contrast both contextually and terminologically to the figure who was raised up as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (CD 1.10-11).⁴⁷

The pairing of **נָטַף** and **כֶּזֶב** is often ascribed to a dependence upon Micah 2.11, which reads:

⁴⁴ Other translations of **אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן** include ‘the scoffer’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004) and ‘the man of mockery’ (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

⁴⁵ Campbell 1995a, pp.51-67. The phrase **אֲנָשֵׁי לְצוֹן** also appears in Proverbs 29.8 where they are contrasted with ‘the wise’ (cf. Bengtsson 2000a, pp.95-96). Furthermore, note the reference to **אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן** in CD 20.11, to be examined below. Richardson (1955), in his examination of forms derived from **לִיץ**, suggests that **לְצוֹן** of Isaiah 28.14 should be rendered in reference to drunken ‘babbling’. Such a negatively associated form of speech would not be an incongruous interpretation of the sectarian polemic against **אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן** (note also the use of **נָטַף**: CD 1.14; cf. 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25). See further **לִיץ** and **נָטַף** in: Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

⁴⁶ See: Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Davidson 2002; Holladay 2000; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995; 1996.

⁴⁷ Thiering 1978, p.201; VanderKam 2003, p.473.

If a man, walking in wind and falsehood, lies {כֹּזֵב} (saying), ‘I will preach {/spout; אֲטַף} to you of wine and strong drink’, he would be a preacher {/spouter; מְטַף} for this people. (Micah 2.11)

Other than the appearance of נִטְף and כֹּזֵב, nothing in particular about this passage is reminiscent of CD 1.10-18a. If however נִטְף was employed in CD 1.14 primarily to contrast the similarly ambivalent term יִרְהָ (itself drawn from Hosea 10.12 and interpreted in the FSL of the text in reference to the anticipated יִוְרֵה הַצֶּדֶק; CD 6.10-11a) and therefore used to compare two types of teaching, the qualification of such spouting as כֹּזֵב might well have been drawn from such a use of נִטְף in Micah 2.11.⁴⁸

‘The Man of Scoffing’ is thus described in terms that ideologically polarise him from the one who is ‘a teacher of righteousness’. He is further accused of having ‘led them (Israel) astray in a wilderness without a way’ (יִהְיֶה בְּתוֹהוֹ לֹא דֶרֶךְ; CD 1.15). Though this phrase may be drawn from Job 12.24 or Psalms 107.40 (Campbell 1995a, pp.51-67; Knibb 1994a, p.24), Isaiah 9.13-15 similarly links false teaching with being led astray and it is interesting to speculate whether this might also have had some bearing upon CD 1.14-15. It reads:

^{9.13}So the LORD cut off from Israel head and tail, palm branch and reed in one day – ¹⁴elders and dignitaries are the head, and a prophet who teaches falsehood {נְבִיא מִוְרֵה שֶׁקֶר} is the tail; ¹⁵for those who led this people led them astray {מִתְעִיםֵם}, and those who were led by them were left in confusion. (Isaiah 9.13-15)⁴⁹

By comparison, the figure described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ has been raised up by God ‘to lead them in the way of his heart’ (CD 1.11a). The two

⁴⁸ Micah 2.11 would certainly appear to have had a more specific influence upon passages containing related terminology elsewhere in the Damascus Document, as we shall examine below (e.g. CD 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a).

⁴⁹ Note the affinity with those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (יִנְבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר) in the FSL (CD 6.1), and the presence of מִוְרֵה (cf. מִוְרֵה צֶדֶק; יִוְרֵה הַצֶּדֶק).

characters, ‘the Man of Scoffing’ and ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (if indeed such was the title applied to the figure described in CD 1.10-11a), are immediately set in opposition by the specific use of scriptural terminology employed to describe them. Two types of teaching and two brands of leadership are contrasted in this passage, represented by two opposing individual figures. It is noteworthy that the terminology used to describe their respective teaching employs (in an indefinite, descriptive sense) the very elements that comprise the two sobriquets *מטִּיף הכֹּזֵב* and *מורה הצדק*, even though these titles themselves have not yet appeared.

The label ‘the Man of Scoffing’ would appear to refer to a figure of the past from the perspective of the ESL. The Yahadic recension of the text identifies the ‘congregation of traitors’ (*עדת בוגדים*; CD 1.12) of the FSL as ‘the last generation’ (CD 1.12) and ‘those who departed from the way’ (CD 1.13). According to this revision they were led astray by *אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן*, who ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ (CD 1.14-15). However, as Phillip Callaway states, it is unclear whether this figure should be regarded as “anterior to or relatively contemporary with the Teacher”, noting further that:

Even if one should consider them to be contemporary, there is still no information about a direct confrontation between them. (Callaway 1988, p.115)⁵⁰

Davies does not altogether discount the possibility that the passage is original and, in that context, referred to the pre-exilic generation having been led astray (Davies 1983, p.70).⁵¹ Nevertheless, the present text would appear to understand this passage in relation to more recent events (for example, the gloss (?) identifying ‘the congregation of traitors’ as ‘the last generation’).⁵² In particular, the insertion of a figure described in distinctly opposing terms as ‘a teacher of

⁵⁰ See further Callaway 1988, pp.116-121.

⁵¹ The secondary nature of CD 1.13-18a is upheld however by Michael Knibb, who argues that, unlike the original pre-Yahadic text, the inserted passage “is concerned not with the nation as a whole, but with a specific group associated with ‘the scoffer’, ... The effect of the insertion is to make the whole of I.13 – II.1 refer to this rival group” (1994a, p.23).

⁵² Davies 1983, p.214, n.33.

righteousness' (CD 1.11) invites the reader to understand the two figures as contemporaneous.

If however we are correct in identifying the reference to מורה צדק (CD 1.11a) as secondary, itself drawing upon the pre-Yahadic expectation of יורה (CD 6.11a), then the fact that the description of 'the Man of Scoffing' appears to have been deliberately conceived in opposition to this figure (e.g. יורה / נטף) might suggest that it too is the result of interpolation.⁵³ In either case, on a conceptual level at least (if not necessarily a historical one), the reader is presented with two figures set firmly in opposition; one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie and led them astray in a wilderness without a way' (CD 1.14-15) and one who was raised up by God as 'a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart' (CD 1.11a). From the perspective of the *historical* question we are perhaps unable to ascertain the precise relationship between 'the Man of Scoffing' and 'the Teacher of the Community'; questions as to whether or not they were contemporary or came into confrontation remain unanswered (though, significantly, it appears likely that this was at least understood to be the case by readers of the Yahadic recension of the text).⁵⁴ Nevertheless, for our examination of the development of the sobriquets, it is sufficient to observe that, even without the appearance of the titles מטיף הכזב and מורה הצדק, a figure described as one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' is in this passage set in marked opposition to 'a teacher of righteousness'.

⁵³ The precedence of יורה over נטף is indicated by the clear dependence of the FSL's יורה (CD 6.11) upon יורה צדק of Hosea 10.12 (see Chapter Two). By comparison, the two elements מטיף and כזב have a weaker relationship in Micah 2.11, suggesting that, while the passage may provide a likely scriptural precedent for the *coupling* of these elements, the inspiration for the employment of נטף was the use elsewhere in the text of the similarly ambivalent יורה.

⁵⁴ Davies likewise notes that uncertainty with regard to the referent of אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן, "leaves open the question whether any particular individual in the history of the Qumran community can be associated with the sobriquet" (1983, p.70).

In terms of such development, there is an intriguing parallel between CD 1.15-16 and a passage examined in the FSL. As seen, ‘the Man of Scoffing’, as well as having ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’, is accused of having:

^{1.15}led them astray {יִתְעִם} in a wilderness without a way, to bring low the everlasting heights and depart ¹⁶from the paths of righteousness and to remove the boundary {לְסִיעַ גְּבוּל} which the forefathers had established in their inheritance (CD 1.15-16).

Similarly, in the FSL we are presented with those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (יִנְבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר; 6.1), who are described as:

those who moved the boundary {מְסִיגֵי הַגְּבוּל} and led Israel astray {יִתְעוּ אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל}. (CD 5.20)⁵⁵

If we are right in identifying CD 1.13-18a as a Yahadic interpolation, then it would appear quite plausible that the pre-Yahadic CD 5.20 – 6.2 has exerted some influence upon the passage. Certainly, according to our analysis above, the arrival of ‘a teacher of righteousness’ in CD 1.10-11a is directly dependent upon the expectation of יוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק in CD 6.2-11a. In this context, Davies, following Stegemann, rightly warns against taking all occurrences of boundary moving in the Damascus Document in reference to the same group and, while noting the ideological similarities between the prophesying of falsehood and the spouting/preaching of lies, is careful to distinguish between the two.⁵⁶ Such an approach is undoubtedly correct as those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ and ‘moved the boundary’ in CD 5.20 – 6.2 are presented as figures of the (pre-exilic?) past from the perspective of the FSL, while the later Yahadic recension of CD 1.10-18a appears to be concerned with more recent events.⁵⁷

However the possibility remains that, though different *historical* groups are here implied, the Yahadic edition of the text deliberately employs borrowed

⁵⁵ Qimron notes that 4Q266 frag.3, 2.7 reads מְסִיגֵי גְבוּל in place of מְסִיגֵי הַגְּבוּל (1992a, p.19). Cf. 4Q267 frag.2, 4.

⁵⁶ Davies 1983, pp.120-121. Cf. R.T. White 1990, p.92, n.43.

⁵⁷ E.g. the apparent gloss, בְּדוֹר אַחֲרָיו (CD 1.12); cf. Davies 1983, p.214, n.33.

terminology to portray the later group as a ‘continuation’ of the earlier one, making the two ideologically identical. We examined in the previous chapter how the pre-Yahadic text anticipated the arrival of ‘one who will teach righteousness’ as an ‘eschatological’ successor to ‘the holy anointed ones’ (משיחֵי הקודש; CD 6.1).⁵⁸ Whilst these were the instruments of God’s teaching in the past, the anointed יורה הצדק (cf. CD 12.23 – 13.1) will confer God’s teaching ‘at the end of days’ (CD 6.11; cf. Hosea 10.12). In similar fashion, just as ‘the holy anointed ones’ of old had their counterparts in those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (ינבאו שקר; CD 6.1), who ‘moved the boundary and led Israel astray’ (CD 5.20), so in the ESL a singular figure labelled ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (CD 1.11a) is set in opposition to one who ‘spouted {/preached} to Israel waters of a lie’ and ‘led them astray (...) to remove the boundary which the forefathers had established in their inheritance’ (CD 1.15-16). Though Davies and Stegemann are correct to distinguish between the groups of CD 1.11-18a and 5.20 – 6.2, the deliberate appropriation of terminology renders the two ideologically identical and is perhaps crucial for our understanding of sobriquet development in the Damascus Document. ‘The Man of Scoffing’ would appear to have been deliberately cast in the mould of ינבאו שקר (CD 6.1), his description as one who ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ demonstrating a preference for נטף over נבא, thus providing a sharper contrast with the act of ירה.⁵⁹

CD 4.19-20

The notion of ‘spouting’ recurs in a passage that warns of the ‘three nets of Belial’ (שלוש מצודות בל יעל; CD 4.15):

⁵⁸ משיחֵי הקודש corrected from משיחוֹ הקודש, following 4Q267 frag.2, 6; 6Q15 frag.3, 4 (cf. Fitzmyer 2000, pp.88-90; Qimron 1992a; Rabinowitz 1954, p.20, n.41).

⁵⁹ On this understanding, the replacement of שקר with the equivalent כזב would result from the subsequent prominence of Micah 2.11 in the mind of the Yahadic redactor.

^{4.19}The ‘builders of the wall’ who walked after צו, *the צו is מטיף*²⁰ *of whom he said “they shall surely spout {דַּמְתִּי מִפִּי}”*, are caught in two (nets). (CD 4.19-20)⁶⁰

Schechter, noting the intrusive gloss concerning צו, translated this expression ‘the commanding one’ (Schechter 1970), taking it as a derivative of צוה.⁶¹ More recently however, while some scholars render it ‘precept’ (Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996), most have preferred to leave it effectively untranslated (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a).⁶² The accusation that the ‘builders of the wall’ are those who הלכו אחרי צו (CD 4.19) would appear to be dependent upon the similar phrase, הלך אחרי צו, in Hosea 5.11 (made in reference to Ephraim and rendered by the *NRSV*, ‘to go after vanity’, with a note adding that the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain).⁶³ Interestingly, this apparent scriptural precedent for walking ‘after צו’ occurs in the context of moving the boundary (מסיגי גבול; Hosea 5.10), reminiscent of CD 1.16 and 5.20, examined already. A further scriptural occurrence of צו, and one that is potentially even more significant for our purposes, occurs in Isaiah 28.10-13, where the phrase צו לצו לצו appears twice (rendered by the *NRSV*, ‘precept upon precept, precept upon precept’, again with a note adding that the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain). Here it is in the immediate context of the reference to the ‘men of scoffing’ (אנשי לצון; Isaiah 28.14), those who have taken refuge in lies (כזב) and falsehood (שקר). As seen, Campbell deems

⁶⁰ Italics signify the Yahadic glosses or expansions to the text, following Davies 1983 (pp.242-243; cf. pp.108-119). Paralleled in 4Q269 frag.3, 1-2; 6Q15 frag.1, 1-2. Interestingly, Milik in his preliminary transcription of 4Q269 proposed to read [הכזב] מטיף in order to extend the line (see J.M. Baumgarten 1996, p.126), though the absence of this form elsewhere in the Damascus Document renders such a reconstruction highly unlikely. More probable would be the indefinite form מטיף כזב (cf. CD 8.13), though the lack of such in CD 4.19-20 means that this reconstruction in 4Q269 would be pure conjecture.

⁶¹ Schechter 1970, p.68, n.23.

⁶² See צו, צוה and שוה in Koehler and Baumgartner 1996; 1999.

⁶³ Cf. Campbell 1995a, pp.116-131.

this passage a likely scriptural precedent for the label ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן; CD 1.14).⁶⁴

The scriptural association of לָצַח with boundary-moving (Hosea 5.10-11) and ‘men of scoffing’ (Isaiah 28.10-14) already highlights a relationship between CD 4.19-20 and 1.10-18a, and in particular between לָצַח and ‘the Man of Scoffing’.⁶⁵ This is heightened by the Yahadic gloss identifying הַלְצוֹן as ‘a spouter’ (מַטִּיף; CD 4.19), about whom the words ‘they shall surely spout’ (הֵמָּה יִטִּיפוּן; CD 4.20) are quoted in an allusion to Micah 2.6. This latter citation appears in the same immediate context as Micah 2.11, already identified as a likely scriptural precedent for the coupling of the two elements מַטִּיף and כֹּזֵב. The expression לָצַח would appear then to be connected with the concept of false or unwholesome preaching both in its scriptural setting (Hosea 5.10-11; Isaiah 28.10-14) and in its employment in the Damascus Document (CD 4.19-20). Indeed, André Dupont-Sommer goes so far as to suggest that לָצַח may have an onomatopoeic function “to describe ironically a prophet’s prating” (1961, p.128, n.10).⁶⁶

The followers of לָצַח are described as the ‘builders of the wall’ (בֹּנֵי הַחֵיץ; CD 4.19), seemingly an allusion to Ezekiel 13 which refers to the people who build a wall (בְּנֵה חֵיץ; Ezekiel 13.10) and the false prophets they follow who daub it with whitewash (מָחִי תַּפֵּל; Ezekiel 13.11).⁶⁷ Once again the expression לָצַח is linked with the concept of false prophecy. Schechter claimed that it was the Pharisees who were here accused (1970, p.68, n.22) while others

⁶⁴ Campbell 1995a, pp.51-67. See n.45 above.

⁶⁵ VanderKam even suggests: “Perhaps the overlap in letters between לָצַח and לְצוֹן is not accidental” (2003, p.474).

⁶⁶ Similarly, William Holladay renders לָצַח a “syllable mimicking prophetic speech” (2000, p.304). Cf. Campbell 1995a, p.125, n.57. See further, Koehler and Baumgartner 1996.

⁶⁷ בֹּנֵי הַחֵיץ corrected from בֹּנֵי הַחוֹץ (CD 4.19; 8.12, 18), following Schechter (1970) and Qimron (1992a). Cf. CD 19.24-25, 31 (בֹּנֵי הַחֵיץ).

have identified the ‘builders of the wall’ with Israel at large, at least in the pre-Yahadic context of the passage (Davies 1983, pp.111-113; Knibb 1994a, p.42). Michael Knibb notes that the accusations of taking two wives in a lifetime (CD 4.20 – 5.6) and niece-marriage (CD 5.7-11) made against the ‘builders of the wall’ applied to “Jewish society in general” (1994a, p.42), but adds that the Yahadic gloss, ‘the זל is a spouter of whom he said “they shall surely spout”’ (CD 4.19-20), has:

the effect of making charges levelled against...Judaism in general refer to a specific group under the leadership of an individual called ‘the preacher’. (Knibb 1994a, p.42)

On this analysis, in the ESL the ‘builders of the wall’ have become synonymous with the followers of ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן) who ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie and led them astray’ (CD 1.14-15). This may in turn suggest that ‘Israel’ in CD 1.14 could be understood in a narrow sense with regard to a specific group led astray by ‘the Man of Scoffing’.

CD 8.12-13 / 19.24b-26a

The ‘builders of the wall’ reappear in the context of a highly significant passage for our examination of the development of the sobriquet, מְטִיף הַכֹּזֶב:

^{8.12}But all these things they did not understand, the ‘builders of the wall’ and the ‘daubers of whitewash’, because ¹³a raiser of wind {שׂוֹקֵל רוּחַ} and מְטִיף כֹּזֶב spouted {הִטִּיף} to them, against all of whose congregation the anger of God was kindled. (CD 8.12-13)

Here we are presented with a reference to מְטִיף כֹּזֶב (note the absence of the definite article), rendered variously ‘[one who] dropped lies’ (Schechter 1970), ‘[one who] preaches lies’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a) or ‘a spouter/spewer of lies’ (Davies 1983 and Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996 respectively). Baumgarten and Schwartz (1995) render the phrase ‘the Spouter of the Lie’, thus seemingly reading מְטִיף כֹּזֶב as synonymous with the definite form מְטִיף הַכֹּזֶב. Sensitive to the absence of the definite article however, we shall read ‘a spouter of a lie’,

akin to our treatment elsewhere in the ESL of מורה צדק ('a teacher of righteousness'; CD 1.11).

As already noted, the coupling of מטיף and כזב would appear to be dependant upon Micah 2.11, which reads:

If a man, walking in wind {הלך רוח} and falsehood, lies {כזב} (saying), 'I will preach {/spout; אטף} to you of wine and strong drink', he would be a preacher {/spouter; מטיף} for this people. (Micah 2.11)

CD 8.12-13 describes the figure of 'a spouter of a lie' as 'a raiser of wind' (שוקל רוח; CD 8.13), thus forming another partial parallel with Micah 2.11 where the 'spouter' is described as 'walking in wind' (הלך רוח).⁶⁸ The influence of Micah 2.11 becomes indisputable once we consider CD 19.24b-26a, a passage from manuscript B of the Cairo Damascus Document that parallels the present passage from manuscript A:

^{19.24}But all these things they did not understand, the 'builders of ²⁵the wall' and 'daubers of whitewash', because of a walker of wind {הולך רוח} and raiser of storms {שקל סופות} and a spouter to men ²⁶of a lie {מטיף אדם לכזב}, against all of whose congregation the anger of God was kindled. (CD 19.24b-26a)

Here the 'spouter' is explicitly described as 'a walker of wind'. However, it is to be noted that the elements מטיף and כזב are no longer in such close association, having been separated by 'אדם ל', rendering the phrase 'a spouter to men of a lie' (CD 19.25-26).⁶⁹ Schechter notes that מטיף אדם (CD 19.25) is reminiscent of מטיף העם (Micah 2.11).⁷⁰ Furthermore, the description in manuscript A of 'a raiser of wind' (שוקל רוח; CD 8.13) might be explained by the presence of שקל in manuscript B, in reference to a 'raiser of storms' (שקל סופות; CD

⁶⁸ Cf. הנביאים יהיו לרוח. (Jeremiah 5.13).

⁶⁹ Literally, 'a spouter of men to a lie' (Davies 1983, pp.260-261).

⁷⁰ Schechter 1970, p.74, n.19.

19.25). It would follow that manuscript B might preserve a slightly earlier reading of the variant phrase, explicitly dependent upon Micah 2.11 for the elements **מטיף**, **כזב** and **הולך רוח** (and perhaps the inclusion of **אדם**, paralleling **העם**):

(CD 19.25-26) **כי הולך רוח ושקל סופות ומטיף אדם לכזב**

Manuscript A, by comparison, harbours less affinity with Micah 2.11 and would appear instead to preserve a condensed form of the above phrase, replacing **הולך** **שוקל רוח**, for example, with simply **רוח ושקל סופות**:

(CD 8.12-13) **כי שוקל רוח ומטיף כזב**

According to this understanding, it is CD 8.12-13 that, abbreviating the passage in manuscript B, first establishes **מטיף** and **כזב** in a construct relationship (in the Damascus Document at least), a move that we might anticipate to be vital in the development of the sobriquet, **מטיף הכזב**.

In addition to Micah 2.11, Ezekiel 13 would appear to have exerted some influence upon CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a, as evidenced by reference to the ‘builders of the wall’ (**בוני החיץ**; CD 8.12; 19.24-25) and ‘daubers of whitewash’ (**מחי (ה)תפל**; CD 8.12; 19.25).⁷¹ In Ezekiel 13, it is ‘the people’ who build the wall (**בנה חיץ**; Ezekiel 13.10) and false prophets who daub it with whitewash (**מחי תפל**; Ezekiel 13.11). However, in CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a both of these groups are placed under the influence of a singular ‘false prophet’ cast in the language of Micah 2.11 as ‘a spouter of a lie’. Consequently, Knibb suggests that the ‘daubers of whitewash’ should be understood in the Damascus Document more generally as the leaders of the people (1994a, p.68). The combination of scriptural passages in this context effectively *creates* a prominent individual role that does not independently exist in either Micah 2.11 or Ezekiel

⁷¹ See n.67 above.

13.⁷² Davies (1983, pp.156-169) and Knibb (1994a, pp.66-68) both regard the use of Micah 2.11 as a *further* gloss on CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a. The ‘spouter’ would appear to have been inserted into the text and as a consequence is placed in a position of authority over the ‘builders of the wall’ and ‘daubers of whitewash’ (so too as seen at CD 4.19-20; cf. 1.10-18a).⁷³ The primary concern of the Yahadic redaction of these passages is the presentation of an authoritative individual cast in scriptural language as an archetypal false prophet. The specific use of language employed renders this figure the ideological antithesis of the ‘teacher’, and thrusts him into an oppositional role within the text. It remains unclear however what, if any, historical realities might lie behind such claims.

CD 20.10-15

The final passage from the Damascus Document to be examined in relation to **מטִיף הכֹּזֵב** comes exclusively from manuscript B of CD:

^{20.10}Like the judgement {משפט} of their companions who turned back ¹¹with אִישׁ אֶל צִוִּן they shall be judged {שפֶּטוֹ}, for they spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חֻקֵּי הַצְדִּיק} and rejected ¹²the covenant and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus; *and that is the new covenant*. ¹³And there shall not be for them or their families a share in the house of הַתּוֹרָה. And from the day of ¹⁴the gathering in {הַאֲסִיף} of יוֹרֵה הַיַּחֲדָד until the end of all the Men of War who turned back ¹⁵with אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב there will be about forty years. (CD 20.10-15)⁷⁴

This is the only explicit reference in the Damascus Document to a figure designated אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב (CD 20.15). There is a clear similarity between this sobriquet and **מטִיף הכֹּזֵב**. Given our understanding of the latter as ‘the Spouter of the Lie’, an appropriate rendering of אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב, reflecting this parallel, would

⁷² Davies notes that the ‘builders of the wall’ and the ‘spouter’ share an exegetical connection within their scriptural contexts, highlighting the parallel between Ezekiel 13.8-10 and Micah 3.5 (1983, pp.166-167). Cf. Eshel 1999a, p.335.

⁷³ In CD 1.10-18a, 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a, it is noteworthy that this insertion brings him into association with a ‘congregation’ (עֵדָה). The significance of this specific context will be examined further in Chapter Four.

⁷⁴ Italics signify a *later* gloss to the Yahadic text of the passage following Davies 1983 (p.263; cf. pp.176-186). See n.31 above.

be ‘the Man of the Lie’ (so too Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).⁷⁵

Bengtsson highlights a scriptural occurrence of אִישׁ כֶּזֶב in Proverbs 19.22 (note however the absence of the definite article).⁷⁶ Interestingly, this appears in the general context of several references to the judgement (מִשְׁפָּט) of scoffers (Proverbs 19.25-29; cf. Richardson 1955), raising the possibility that this may have informed the (earliest?) employment of אִישׁ הַכֶּזֶב in the present passage from the Damascus Document.

How then should we interpret the relationship between ‘the Man of the Lie’ (CD 20.15) and ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן; CD 1.14) who ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ (CD 1.14-15; cf. 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a)? The judgement of those who are ‘covert traitors’ is here compared with that dealt to ‘overt traitors’, ‘their companions who turned back with the Men of Scoffing {אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן}’ (CD 20.10-11).⁷⁷ It would appear that it is the *latter* group of whom it is said that ‘they spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חֻקֵּי הַצְדִּיק} and rejected the covenant and the pact’ and consequently they *and their families* are excluded from ‘the house of הַתּוֹרָה’ (CD 20.11-13). By comparison, in the case of the ‘covert traitors’, only they themselves are afforded the same judgement (CD 20.8-10).⁷⁸ It would appear reasonable to assume that

⁷⁵ Note also however, ‘the man of lies’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Schechter 1970) and ‘the Liar’ (Bengtsson 2000a, p.107; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004).

⁷⁶ Bengtsson 2000a, p.98. A plural form, אֲנָשֵׁי כֶּזֶב, also appears in Sirach 15.8, reminiscent of אֲנָשֵׁי לְצוֹן (‘men of scoffing’) in Isaiah 28.14 and Proverbs 29.8 (note אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן in the present passage; CD 20.11).

⁷⁷ See for example Davies 1983, pp.182-186.

⁷⁸ Murphy-O’Connor (following Stegemann), adopts a different understanding of the passage, regarding the former group, the ‘covert traitors’, as the subject of דָּבָר (CD 20.11) and hence as those who ‘spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חֻקֵּי הַצְדִּיק} and rejected the covenant and the pact’ (20.11-12). He is forced therefore by the repetition of ‘a share in the house of הַתּוֹרָה’ (CD 20.10, 13) to regard one instance as an interpolation (Murphy-O’Connor 1972, pp.552-556). The understanding outlined above however, convincingly argued for by Davies (1983, pp.184-186), remains a simpler and more cogent explanation of the text.

‘the Men of Scoffing’ (אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן; CD 20.11) are in some way associated with ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן; CD 1.14) who is accused of having caused Israel to ‘depart from the paths of righteousness’ (CD 1.15-16).

In order to ascertain the relationship between ‘the Man of Scoffing’ and ‘the Man of the Lie’, it may be helpful to compare those ‘who turned back with the Men of Scoffing’ (CD 20.10-11) with those ‘who turned back with the Man of the Lie’ (CD 20.14-15):

אֲשֶׁר שָׁבוּ עִם אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן (CD 20.10-11)

אֲשֶׁר שָׁבוּ עִם אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב (CD 20.14-15)

The two phrases are constructed in identical fashion, inviting the reader to understand the two as comparable. Knibb suggests that those ‘who turned back with the Men of Scoffing’ are the same group mentioned a little way above in CD 19.33b – 20.1a (1994a, p.73).⁷⁹ Certainly, just as the former are described as having ‘turned back’ (שָׁבוּ) and rejected the (new) covenant made ‘in the land of Damascus’ (CD 20.10-12), the latter are described as having ‘entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned {שָׁבוּ} and betrayed and departed from the well of living water’ (CD 19.33-34). On the other hand, we have previously noted the similarity between the following two phrases:

^{19.35}from the day of the gathering in {מִיּוֹם הָאָסֶף} of ^{20.1}the Teacher of the Community until {עַד} there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel. (CD 19.35 – 20.1)

^{20.13}from the day of ¹⁴the gathering in {מִיּוֹם הָאָסֶף} of the Teacher of the Community until {עַד} the end of all the Men of War who turned back ¹⁵with the Man of the Lie there will be about forty years. (CD 20.13-15)

The first of these applies to the period during which the group who ‘departed from the well of living water’ in CD 19.33-34, ‘shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written’ (CD 19.35). If we

⁷⁹ Also, Murphy-O’Connor 1972, p.549.

are right in identifying these two described periods, the start of each being signalled by the death of ‘the Teacher of the Community’, then as well as positing that renewed messianic expectations envisaged the arrival of ‘the messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ within ‘about forty years’, we might also assume that the faithless ‘Men of War’ (cf. Deuteronomy 1.35; 2.7; 2.14) who ‘turned back {שבו} with the Man of the Lie’ are also to be identified with those who ‘turned’ (שבו) from the covenant in CD 19.33b – 20.1a. Thus those ‘who turned back with the Men of Scoffing’ (CD 20.10-11), those ‘who turned back with the Man of the Lie’ (CD 20.14-15) and those who ‘turned’ from the covenant (CD 19.33b – 20.1a) should most likely be regarded as identical.

Such an interpretation would suggest that ‘the Man of the Lie’ (איש הכוזב; CD 20.15) and ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (איש הלצון; CD 1.14) might be labels denoting the same figure.⁸⁰ Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, following Stegemann, regards the reference to ‘the Man of the Lie’ as an interpolation, the purpose of which is “to identify the men of mockery with the followers of the Man of Lies” (1972, p.552).⁸¹ Whether a later interpolation or an intrinsic part of this Yahadic redaction, it remains a reasonable assumption that in the present form of the text at least, the titles איש הכוזב and איש הלצון would have been understood as synonymous.⁸² In that context, William Brownlee suggests that the

⁸⁰ So too, for example: Bengtsson 2000a, pp.88-98; Brownlee 1982, pp.9-10; Callaway 1988, pp.116-121; Davies 1983, p.187; Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.122, n.4; Fröhlich 2004, p.4; Gmirkin 2000; Knibb 1994a, pp.23-24, 73-74; Vermes 2004, p.54.

⁸¹ Cf. n.78 above.

⁸² In addition, it may not be inconsequential that the only scriptural occurrence of איש כוזב (Proverbs 19.22), as noted above, appears in the general context of several references to scoffers (Proverbs 19.25-29). It is the combination of scriptural allusions throughout the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, in particular the use of כוזב terminology (e.g. Micah 2.11, in association with נטף) and reference to scoffers (e.g. Isaiah 28.10-15, in association with צו and כוזב), that may have suggested the suitability of Proverbs 19.22-29 (mentioning scoffers in association with כוזב) and hence first influenced the employment of the appellation איש הכוזב as a suitable scripturally-grounded alternative description of the figure otherwise known as איש הלצון. In this context it is interesting to note that, according to Richardson, the verbal root ליץ (from which לצון is derived) could be interpreted (e.g. in the Septuagint rendering of Proverbs 9.12) in reference to the noun forms “lie, falsehood, untruth” (1955, pp.164-165). See further, Clines (ed.) 1998; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

label ‘the Man of the Lie’ deliberately “parodies the Old Testament title ‘man of God’ for a prophet” (1982, p.10), thus bringing to mind the various accusations of false prophecy and spouting of lies associated seemingly with ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (CD 1.10-18a; 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a).⁸³ We would appear therefore to be presented with an individual oppositional figure cast in the mould of a false prophet, referred to both as ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן; CD 1.14) and ‘the Man of the Lie’ (אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב; CD 20.15), and described as ‘a spouter {/preacher} of a lie’ (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26).⁸⁴

Just as in the first column of CD, where ‘the Man of Scoffing’ is presented in opposition to the ‘teacher’ and his group are described as those ‘who departed from the way’ (CD 1.13) and have been caused to ‘depart from the paths of righteousness’ (CD 1.15-16), so here ‘the Man of the Lie’ is rendered in an oppositional role to ‘the Teacher of the Community’ and a group are described as having ‘turned back’ (CD 20.14) with him and spoken ‘perversely against the decrees of righteousness’ (CD 20.11). It is significant, as noted by Callaway, that in spite of the clear oppositional role played by ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’, there is “no evidence of any personal confrontation” (1988, p.121).⁸⁵

The relevant passages would appear to suggest that it was the ‘teacher’ and his group from whom the others departed, at least from the perspective of the Yahad (if those accused were members of the pre-Yahadic movement, they may well have viewed the Yahad as having departed from them).⁸⁶ This interpretation is supported by the accusation that they ‘spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חֲקֵי הַצֶּדֶק}’ (CD 20.11). We have already noted how reference

⁸³ Hanan Eshel similarly regards ‘the Man of the Lie’ as having been deliberately presented in the role of a false prophet (1999a, p.335).

⁸⁴ Bengtsson argues that, in principle, “two different epithets could be invented for one and the same character... A weighty argument in favour of a single identity for two similar sobriquets would be that they are depicted correspondingly and associated with the same features...” (2000a, p.89). For the present, the points of correspondence between אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן and אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב are sufficient to favour such an understanding over an assumption of distinct identities.

⁸⁵ Such an insight may have important historical implications. If a direct confrontation had indeed taken place historically between two so-named figures, would it not perhaps find mention here?

⁸⁶ See Davies 2002, p.93; Jokiranta 2001, p.234; Murphy-O’Connor 1974, p.236.

to יורה הצדק might function as an implicit claim to the arrival of יורה הצדק and the supplementation of the decrees issued by ‘the Seeker of the Law’ for the interim period (CD 6.8-11a).⁸⁷ That the followers of ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ ‘spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness’ implies that they rejected the claim of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ to be the anticipated ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (CD 6.11a). They are the antithesis of the loyal members of the Yahad who ‘listened to the voice of a teacher of righteousness, and do not reject the decrees of righteousness {חקי הצדק} when they hear them’ (CD 20.32-33).

In this context it is also interesting to note that the followers of ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ are further accused of rejecting:

the covenant and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus; *and that is the new covenant*. (CD 20.12)⁸⁸

This departure from the (new) covenant is echoed, as seen, in CD 19.33-34 where they are portrayed as those who ‘entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned {שבו} and betrayed and departed from the well of living water’ (CD 19.33-34). Several scholars have noted that ‘and that is the new covenant’ (וזהו ברית החדשה; CD 20.12) would appear to be a later gloss (e.g. Callaway 1988, pp.121-127; Davies 1983, pp.176-186, 263; Murphy-O’Connor 1972, p.550, n.20), implying that in the first instance it was simply ‘the covenant’ (without further qualification) that was rejected. Davies argues convincingly that ‘the covenant in the land of Damascus’ was a designation originally held by the pre-Yahadic movement but which continued to be used by the Yahad who, acknowledging the arrival of ‘a teacher of righteousness’, perceived themselves to be the legitimate continuation of that movement.⁸⁹ However, as the wider

⁸⁷ See n.41 above.

⁸⁸ Italics signify a *later* gloss to the Yahadic text of the passage following Davies 1983 (p.263; cf. pp.176-186). See n.31 above.

⁸⁹ As Davies notes: “If indeed a small group adhering to a messianic leader seceded from a larger group, the texts from this smaller group present an inverted history...: it was the larger group that

movement who rejected ‘the Teacher of the Community’, and presumably still awaited one who would ‘teach righteousness at the end of days’, held on to the same designation, it eventually became necessary for the Yahad to further qualify themselves as ‘the *new* covenant in the land of Damascus’, superseding the ‘old’ covenant.⁹⁰

If we are to accept that the followers of ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ were originally accused of having rejected simply ‘the covenant’, as seems likely, the question remains as to whether the ‘old’ covenant of the pre-Yahadic movement is meant or the continuation of that covenant within the Yahad (later to be qualified as ‘the *new* covenant’).⁹¹ Was their departure from the pre-Yahadic movement or from the Yahad? In the present (glossed) form of the text at least, the latter is clearly suggested. However, was this always the case? As seen, Davies argues that the covenant ‘entered’ (נכנס) in CD 19.33-34 and ‘affirmed’ (קיים) in CD 20.11-12 originally referred to that of the pre-Yahadic movement, with the later inclusion of the qualification ‘new’ wrongly suggesting that “those condemned had once been members of the Teacher’s community” (1983, p.177).⁹² However, he himself notes:

the fact that ‘new covenant’ is a gloss on ‘covenant in the land of Damascus’ at XX, 12 shows that at one point the older terminology persisted. (Davies 1983, p.177)

It would remain equally possible therefore that the continuation of the covenant *within the Yahad* is here referred to, at a time when “the older terminology

deserted *them*, in rejecting the true leader” (2002, p.93). See also, Jokiranta 2001, p.234; Murphy-O’Connor 1974, p.236.

⁹⁰ See Davies 1983, pp.176-186. Note Jeremiah 31.31 which mentions a ‘new covenant’ (ברית חדשה), interestingly in the context of a planting metaphor (Jeremiah 31.27-34; cf. CD 1.4-11a). In the light of this, Phillip Callaway interprets the evidence differently, regarding the gloss in CD 20.12 to reflect efforts to “harmonize this reference to the Damascan covenant with others in CD, not to distinguish a parent from an offspring...community” (1988, p.125). The position adopted by Davies however best accords with the other evidence of redaction present in the text and yet does not preclude the possibility that Jeremiah 31.31 may have influenced the adoption of the specific qualification ‘*new* covenant’ (cf. Campbell 1995a).

⁹¹ Cf. Rabinowitz 1954, p.31, n.113.

⁹² See n.31 above.

persisted” prior to the need for further qualification. The followers of ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ could accordingly be defectors from the Yahad itself.

In fact the difference between these two positions is not so great. That the Yahad appear to have perceived themselves as *the legitimate continuation of ‘the covenant in the land of Damascus’* suggests that (originally at least) they would not have considered themselves to constitute a new or different movement (as indeed suggested by the persistence of the ‘older terminology’). In other words, ‘the covenant’ in CD 20.12, even prior to the qualification ‘new’, referred to the Yahad in as much as the former was considered synonymous with the latter. The rejection of the covenant in CD 20.10-15 appears in the context of the rejection of the ‘teacher’ and ‘the decrees of righteousness’. Therefore, any among ‘the covenant in the land of Damascus’, a movement that has *evolved into the Yahad* (from a Yahadic perspective), who rejected the authority of the ‘teacher’ (whether at the moment of his arrival or at a later stage) were considered to have rejected ‘the covenant’.⁹³ The only question that remains is whether those here accused had ever consciously accepted the ‘teacher’, later to reject him, or had merely been perceived as having ‘affirmed’ and subsequently ‘turned back’ from the Yahad in as much as it was considered synonymous with ‘the covenant in the land of Damascus’. Though defection from the Yahad is indeed the issue here, Davies is right therefore to note the possibility at least that “those condemned had not ‘entered a *new* covenant’ at all” (1983, p.177).

Summary

The sobriquet **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** does not appear in the Damascus Document, though we are presented with the sobriquets **אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן** (‘the Man of Scoffing’; CD 1.14) and **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** (‘the Man of the Lie’; CD 20.15), both seemingly synonymous titles for a figure described repeatedly as ‘a spouter of a lie’ (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). We have observed that the deliberate employment of such scriptural language (drawing, for example, upon Isaiah 28,

⁹³ See n.89 above.

Ezekiel 13 and Micah 2) demonstrates ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ to have been conceived in opposition to ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (מורה / יורה היחיד; CD 20.1; 20.14), described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (CD 1.11; 20.32). The dual understanding of נמך as both ‘to spout / drip’ and ‘to preach’ (specifically indicative of false prophecy) is, for example, reminiscent of the same duality with regard to ירה in reference to ‘raining’ or ‘teaching’.

We noted in Chapter Two that in the FSL of the Damascus Document there existed a degree of dualistic phraseology in CD 5.16 – 6.11a.⁹⁴ In particular the text attested a dichotomy between the ‘holy anointed ones’ (משיחי הקודש; 6.1) as true prophets (cf. Bowley 1999, p.359) and those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (ינבאו שקר; 6.1). We observed that the anticipated ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (יורה הצדק; CD 6.11) was presented as an ‘eschatological’ successor to משיחי הקודש. Just as ‘the holy anointed ones’ were the instruments of God’s teaching in the past, so the anointed יורה הצדק (cf. CD 12.23 – 13.1) would confer God’s teaching ‘at the end of days’ (CD 6.11; cf. Hosea 10.12). While no opposition to this figure was seemingly envisaged, we posited that should any counter-figure arise he would by contrast be cast in the typological mould of those who ‘prophesied falsehood’. Our examination of the ESL of the Damascus Document would appear to confirm this hypothesis, with ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ depicted in opposition to the ‘teacher’ as ‘a spouter of a lie’ (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26) and in the role of a false prophet.⁹⁵

⁹⁴ See Chapter Two, n.45.

⁹⁵ Cf. Brownlee 1982, p.10; Eshel 1999a, p.335. John Collins, espousing the influence of Persian dualism upon the earliest layers of the Qumran-related texts, interestingly notes that: “In the Gathas, the oldest part of the Avesta, which are generally considered to be the work of Zoroaster himself, ...the opponents of Zoroaster are ‘the followers of the Lie’, and the evil spirit is ‘He who is of the Lie’” (1995b, pp.32-33). It is tempting to speculate whether this typology may have had any influence on the predominant use of כוזב and שקר terminology to describe the opponents of the ‘teacher’, in particular ‘the Man of the Lie’ and those who ‘turned back’ with him (CD 20.13-15). Note however Dimant 1984, p.546, n.295.

3.2.1.3. Sobriquets in the (Yahadic) Damascus Document

Though no occurrences of *מורי הצדק* or *מטף הכזב* are to be found in the ESL of the Damascus Document, we are presented with ‘the Teacher of the Community’ and ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’, described respectively as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (*מורה צדק*; CD 1.11; 20.32; cf. 20.28) and ‘a spouter of a lie’ (*מטף כזב*; CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). These descriptions would appear to owe much to the FSL of the text, where the former figure is expressly anticipated as ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (*יורה הצדק*; CD 6.11) and the typology for describing the latter is readily available. Davies suggests that the ‘teacher’ is deliberately presented as a ‘new Moses’ while the ‘spouter’ is a ‘false Moses’, echoing perhaps the dualistic phraseology of CD 5.16 – 6.11 in the FSL.⁹⁶ However, as Callaway points out, despite the juxtaposition of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ and ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’, there is “no evidence of any personal confrontation” (1988, p.121). Nevertheless, leaving aside the historical question, our analysis suggests that (with Eshel):

we may categorize the debate that takes place between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of Lies as the major event in the life of the Teacher of Righteousness, at least in the eyes of the author of the *Damascus Document*. (Eshel 1999a, p.333)

In other words, though the existence of a historical confrontation between these two figures is uncertain, the polarity between the ‘teacher’ and the ‘spouter’ (expressed both through context and terminology) remains a central theme throughout the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document. Their respective descriptions in the ESL as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (*מורה צדק*) and ‘a spouter of a lie’ (*מטף כזב*), drawing upon the FSL and relevant scriptural terminology, would appear to pave the way for the absent sobriquets *מורה הצדק* and *מטף הכזב*.

⁹⁶ Davies 1988, p.316.

3.2.2. The Hodayot⁹⁷

3.2.2.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’

1QH^a 7.17b-22a [15.14-19]

The elements יָרָה and צַדִּיק are not found in conjunction in the Hodayot and hence neither מִוֶּרֶה הַצַּדִּיק, nor its indefinite counterpart מִוֶּרֶה צַדִּיק, are attested in the H-material. Forms of both יָרָה and צַדִּיק do however appear independently and therefore several passages are nevertheless worthy of consideration in our examination of the sobriquet’s development. The first of these is from column 7 of the re-ordered 1QH^a:

7.17 You alone have [creat]ed צַדִּיק¹⁸ and from the womb you determined him for the time of approval to keep your covenant and to walk in all things, and to ... on him¹⁹ in the abundance of your compassion, and to open all the narrowness of his soul to eternal salvation and endless peace without want, and you have raised²⁰ his glory from flesh. But the wicked {רָשָׁעִים} you have created for [the time] of your [w]rath and from the womb you have ordained them for the day of slaughter,²¹ for they walk in a way {בְּדֶרֶךְ} that is not good, and they reject your covenant, and your [...] their soul loathes, and they take no pleasure in what²² you command but choose what you hate. (1QH^a 7.17b-22a) [= Sukenik 15.14-19]

The passage concerns the creation by God of צַדִּיק, rendered variously as ‘the just’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Vermes 2004) or ‘the righteous’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961). Other scholars, noting that צַדִּיק would appear in the context of this passage to refer to a singular figure, have rendered more freely ‘the just man’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997) or ‘the righteous one’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; cf. Wernberg-Møller 1953, p.315).⁹⁸ In recognition of this insight, this thesis shall adopt, with some

⁹⁷ The large Cave 1 text of the Hodayot (or ‘Thanksgiving Hymns’), 1QH^a, was originally published by Eliezer Sukenik (1955). Since then however, the work of Émile Puech (1988) and Hartmut Stegemann (1990; 1993; 2000) has contributed greatly to our understanding of the text and resulted in a re-ordering (and thus re-numbering) of the columns to reflect the original arrangement of the scroll (cf. Puech 2000). For the purposes of this thesis we shall adopt the revised column and line numbering presented in *DSSSE* (García Martínez and Tigchelaar (eds) 1997), with Sukenik’s numbering in parentheses where appropriate.

⁹⁸ Sung-Hae Kim, while condoning such renderings as ‘the righteous’ or ‘the just man’, claims that they are “not completely satisfactory” as the meaning of צַדִּיק “changes within the Hebrew Bible” (1985, p.153, n.2). It can, for example, be used in a legal sense to indicate ‘the innocent’ or

modification for purposes of clarity, the latter of these, thus rendering צדִיק (within this context at least), ‘the righteous (one)’.

Sung-Hae Kim notes the extensive employment of צדִיק throughout the Hebrew Bible (206 times), often juxtaposed by reference to רשע (‘the wicked (one)’).⁹⁹ Of particular significance for our examination of the Hodayot, he observes the usage of צדִיק as a ‘type’ in the book of Psalms:

Since the psalmists always presuppose the concept of righteousness and never explicitly describe their image of the righteous man, it is hard to extract a clear picture of *saddîq* from the psalms. On the other hand, the image of the wicked as the persecutor of the righteous man does stand out; so there is a rich enough context for us to draw a clear picture: the righteous in the psalms ... is a passive sufferer who appeals his cause to God (Pss 7:8; 58:11; 75:7, etc.). ... Though *saddîq* occurs in hymns and thanksgiving songs, it is found mostly in the individual laments, where both epithets – righteous and wicked – occur. (Kim 1985, p.170)

Given this general scriptural foundation we must be extremely cautious about attributing any especial note to the employment of צדִיק in the Hodayot. As Kim observes of the book of Psalms, so in our passage the lot of ‘the righteous (one)’ (צדִיק; 1QH^a 7.18) is set in opposition to that of ‘the wicked’ (pl. רשעים; 1QH^a 7.20). Indeed, of the seven occurrences of צדִיק in 1QH^a, six appear discernibly in the context of ‘the wicked’ (6.14-16; 7.17b-20; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13; the exception being 1QH^a 8.18).¹⁰⁰ Other instances of צדִיק-related

‘the vindicated’, and often appears in the prophetic books “for the innocent man who suffers at the hand of the persecutor” (p.166), an image that occurs frequently in the Qumran-related Hodayot texts. Kim likewise notes that, while צדִיק can have a communal application (e.g. Isaiah 26.2), it remains “predominantly an individual image” (pp.166-167), as indeed we would appear to find in the passage presently under consideration. See further, Koehler and Baumgartner 1996.

⁹⁹ Kim 1985, p.153, n.1. There are 23 appearances of צדִיק in the Tetrateuch and Deuteronomic history, 45 in the Prophets, 51 in the Psalms, and 87 in the wisdom writings. Kim notes that in more than a third of these occurrences, צדִיק is directly contrasted with רשע.

¹⁰⁰ One of these occurrences of צדִיק, 1QH^a 6.15, is in reference to God, thus indicating a plurality of application. Again the same phenomenon is true of the book of Psalms, where of the 51 appearances of צדִיק, “seven occurrences describe God as righteous (7:12; 11:7; 112:4; 116:5; 119:37; 129:4; 145:17)” (Kim 1985, p.170). In addition to these, a plural form, צדיקים, appears in 1QH^a 9.36. Cf. also צדִיקִים in 1QH^a 17.9.

terms likewise appear juxtaposed with רשע or רשעים (e.g. 1QH^a 4.20-21; 5.25-27; 6.9-10; 10.12-13).¹⁰¹

Such occurrences of צדיק, contextualised as they are, would appear to be the result of stock terminology and scriptural themes. They may therefore bear no relation whatsoever to the יורה הצדק of the FSL or מורה צדק appearing elsewhere in the ESL, and thus convey little with regard to specific sobriquet development. On the other hand, we have already witnessed in the Damascus Document the role of scriptural typologies in the development of apparent sobriquets or descriptive terminology. It is therefore worth perhaps taking a closer look at ‘the righteous (one)’ (צדיק) of 1QH^a 7.17b-22a.

The individual described as צדיק, determined from the womb ‘for the time of approval’ (למועד רצון), is charged to keep the covenant and ‘to walk in all things’ (לתהלך בכול; 1QH^a 7.18).¹⁰² ‘The wicked’ (רשעים) however, created ‘for [the time] of your [w]rath’ (reconstructing לנקץ חר[ו]נוכה; 1QH^a 7.20) and ordained from the womb ‘for the day of slaughter’, are said to both reject the covenant and ‘walk in a way that is not good’ (הלכו בדרך לא טוב; 1QH^a 7.21).¹⁰³ A sharp contrast is therefore drawn between the two. Indeed, the passage contains several elements reminiscent of the first columns of the (pre-Yahadic) Cairo Damascus Document. There a similar contrast is drawn between ‘the life of the righteous (one)’ (נפש צדיק; CD 1.20) and ‘those who walk perfectly’ (הולכי תמים; CD 1.20-21) on the one hand, and those who ‘broke the covenant’ (יעבירו ברית; CD 1.20) and ‘depart from the way’ (סררי דרך; CD

¹⁰¹ It is tempting here to recall the apparent conflict between ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה הצדק) and ‘the Wicked Priest’ (הכוהן הרשע) in the later pesharim. Might this have a typological foundation in the juxtaposition of צדק and רשע in the Hodayot and relevant scriptural passages?

¹⁰² Assuming something has dropped out, some scholars supply ‘to walk in all *your* ways’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004). Svend Holm-Nielsen suggests that לתהלך בכול may have the meaning ‘to walk (uprightly) in all things’ (1960, p.227, cf. p.230, n.15).

¹⁰³ Cf. Isaiah 65.2 (עם סורר ההלכים הדרך לא טוב).

2.6) on the other.¹⁰⁴ The context in the Damascus Document is likewise ‘the time of wrath’ (בְּקֵץ חֲרוֹן; CD 1.5) and interestingly those who ‘broke the covenant’ are further accused of having ‘justified the wicked (one) and condemned the righteous (one)’ (יִצְדִּיקוּ רָשָׁע וִירְשִׁיעוּ צַדִּיק; CD 1.19).¹⁰⁵ The *insertion* of מוֹרָה צַדִּיק and אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן (who ‘led them (Israel) astray in a wilderness without a way {לֹא דֶרֶךְ}, (...) delivering them to the avenging sword of the vengeance of the covenant’; CD 1.14-17) in the Yahadic redaction of the text (ESL), imposes within the Damascus Document (intentionally or not) a reinterpretation of ‘the righteous (one)’ (צַדִּיק; CD 1.19-20) and ‘the wicked (one)’ (רָשָׁע; CD 1.19) in the light of these figures. Might צַדִּיק have been similarly understood in our present text from the Hodayot?

Though some thematic overlaps would appear to exist between 1QH^a 7.17b-22a and the FSL of CD 1-2, in both instances it is primarily a scriptural typology contrasting צַדִּיק and רָשָׁע that would appear to be at work.¹⁰⁶ Certainly there is nothing to suggest that ‘the righteous (one)’ (צַדִּיק) of the Hodayot should be understood as an explicit reference to the יוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק of the FSL or indeed מוֹרָה צַדִּיק appearing elsewhere in the ESL.¹⁰⁷ However, it is possible that this commonplace scriptural type, employed among the sectarian literature, may have influenced or helped shape the expectation of one who would embody such an ideal. The most therefore that can be said of the reference to צַדִּיק in

¹⁰⁴ The identification of those who ‘broke the covenant’ (יַעֲבִירוּ בְרִית; CD 1.20) with those who ‘depart from the way’ (סִרְרִי דֶרֶךְ; CD 2.6) is made explicit in the Yahadic redaction of the text belonging to the ESL (הֵם סִרְרִי דֶרֶךְ; CD 1.13).

¹⁰⁵ צַדִּיק and רָשָׁע here employed in the legal sense noted by Kim (cf. n.98 above) to indicate the innocent and the guilty. Note by comparison CD 4.7 (וִיצְדִּיקוּ צַדִּיק וִירְשִׁיעוּ רָשָׁע).

¹⁰⁶ Nevertheless, such contextual thematic overlaps may yet indicate that CD 1-2 (FSL) bore some influence upon the author of 1QH^a 7.17b-22a (ESL).

¹⁰⁷ Neither should the references to צַדִּיק of the past in the FSL of the Damascus Document be associated too closely with the anticipated יוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק of the future in CD 6.11a. It is only in the post-teacher Yahadic redaction that such an association might be retrospectively implied.

1QH^a 7.17b-22a is that it may have been read and understood by sectarian readers in the retrospective light of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’.¹⁰⁸

1QH^a 10.13-15a [2.13-15a]

A further passage from the Hodayot that may be of some significance in its employment of צדק comes from column 10 of the re-ordered 1QH^a, one of the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’.¹⁰⁹

^{10.13}But you have set me like a banner to the בחירי צדק, and a מליץ דעת of wonderful mysteries, to test ¹⁴[the men of] truth and to try those who love instruction. And I have become a man of dispute {ריב} to מליצי תעות [but a man of ¹⁵pea]ce to all seers of truth {חוזי נבוחות}. (1QH^a 10.13-15a) [= Sukenik 2.13-15a]

¹⁰⁸ This figure may presumably have similarly been *read into* scriptural occurrences of צדק. The contrast with רשע in such passages (scriptural and sectarian), as well as perhaps providing the impetus for the conflict between ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה הצדק) and ‘the Wicked Priest’ (הכונה הרשע) in the later pesharim (see n.101 above), may have subsequently been read in the light of this apparent conflict.

¹⁰⁹ Sukenik was the first to suggest that ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ might have authored at least part of the Hodayot (1955, p.39). Since then numerous scholars have adopted such a standpoint, basing the assumption upon significant similarities between events which befall ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ in the pesharim and those experienced by the protagonist of the Hodayot (e.g. Abegg 1997; Allegro 1981; Bengtsson 2000a, pp.179-196; Douglas 1999; Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.200; Fujita 1976, p.40, n.35; García Martínez 2002; Mowinckel 1956, pp.275-276; Stegemann 1998, p.107). Other scholars, noting for example the Hodayot’s heavy dependence upon scripture, have warned against reading too deeply into such an identification (e.g. Burrows 1958, pp.324-341; Callaway 1988, pp.185-197; Davies 1987, pp.87-105; Harkins 2005, p.235, n.6; Holm-Nielsen 1960, pp.39, 316-331, 332-348; Kittel 1981, pp.9-11; Knibb 1990, p.54; 1994a, p.166; Vermes 1981, p.27). A more cautious examination of these similarities has led Davies to conclude that the pesharim are dependent upon the Hodayot for their information concerning ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’, thus nullifying any theory of identification made on the grounds of similarity between the two, while affirming that “*within* the Qumran community these hymns – and at the very least the autobiographical ones – were *understood* to be compositions of the ‘Teacher’” (Davies 1987, pp.89-90; my italics; cf. however Knibb 1990, p.54). Gert Jeremias classified 1QH^a 10(2).1-19, 10(2).31-39, 11(3).1-18, 12(4).5 – 13(5).4, 13(5).5-19, 13(5).20 – 15(7).5, 15(7).6-25 and 16(8).4-40 as ‘Hymns of the Teacher’ (‘Lehrerlieder’) while others have come to be regarded as ‘Hymns of the Community’. An excellent summary of the ‘Teacher Hymn Hypothesis’, including differing identifications of the ‘Lehrerlieder’, appears in Douglas 1999 (see further Collins and Dimant 1994; Schuller 1994a). These classifications are useful as they do indeed appear to indicate separate blocks of material (often identified by use of ‘I’ or ‘we’ respectively). With regard to authorship however, we shall for the present go only as far as Davies (in agreement with our findings above concerning צדק; cf. n.107 and n.108), accepting the suggestion that the Hodayot “were regarded as compositions of the Teacher” as “a more modest and indeed a more secure basis on which to build a comparison between them and the pesharim” (Davies 1987, p.93; so too Callaway 1994, p.417).

This passage, written in the first-person, speaks of those designated **בְּחִירֵי צֶדֶק** (cf. 4Q184 frag.1, 14; 4Q215a frag.1, 2.2), rendered variously ‘the elect of justice’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), ‘the elect of righteousness’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Vermes 2004) or ‘the chosen (ones) of righteousness’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Knibb 1994a; Mansoor 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Similarly, in 1QH^a 6.15 we find ‘all your elect/chosen are truth’ (**אִמְתָּ כֹּל בְּחִירֵיךָ**), interestingly in the immediate context of the application of **צֶדֶק** to God (see n.100 above). This may suggest that **בְּחִירֵי צֶדֶק** here should be taken in conjunction with the ‘[men of] truth’ (**אִמְתָּ [אֲנָשִׁי]**; 1QH^a 10.14) and perhaps also, though a synonym is used, the ‘seers of truth’ (**חֲזוּי נְבוּחֹת**; 1QH^a 10.15).¹¹⁰

The speaker describes himself as **מְלִיץ דַּעַת** of wonderful mysteries’ (1QH^a 10.13). **מְלִיץ** would appear in this context to indicate a mediatory role (cf. 2 Chronicles 32.31; Job 33.23), thus suggesting ‘a mediator of knowledge’ as a suitable rendering of **מְלִיץ דַּעַת**.¹¹¹ The speaker is set in clear opposition in the passage to ‘mediators of error’ (**מְלִיצֵי תַעֲוָה**; 1QH^a 10.14).¹¹² Such conflicting mediatory roles are instantly reminiscent of the two conflicting types of teaching, **יִרְה** and **נִמְרֵי**, contrasted in the Damascus Document and associated with ‘the

¹¹⁰ Cf. **חֲזוּי אִמְתָּ** (CD 2.12-13).

¹¹¹ Other scriptural contexts may indicate an *interpretive* role for **מְלִיץ** (cf. Genesis 42.23; Isaiah 43.27), though Richardson has cast doubt on the accuracy of these readings (Richardson 1955, pp.167-169). See further **לִיץ** and **מְלִיץ** in Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995. Both interpretations are represented in the variety of renderings proffered for **מְלִיץ דַּעַת**: ‘knowledgeable mediator’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); ‘informed mediator’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); ‘discerning interpreter’ (Vermes 2004); ‘knowledgeable interpreter’ (Knibb 1994a); ‘knowing interpreter’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960); ‘interpreter of knowledge’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Mansoor 1961); cf. ‘wise sower’ (García Martínez 1996). Note the plural form **מְלִיצֵי דַּעַת** in 1QH^a 23[bottom].6.

¹¹² In addition to ‘mediators of error’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996), other scholars have suggested: ‘advocators of error’ (Mansoor 1961); ‘interpreters of error’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004); ‘interpreters of straying’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961); ‘those who spread fallacies’ (García Martínez 1996). See n.111 above.

Teacher of the Community' ('a teacher of righteousness') and 'the Man of Scoffing / the Lie' ('a spouter of a lie') respectively.¹¹³

The description of those tried by 'a mediator of knowledge' (מל"ץ דעת) as 'those who love instruction' (אוהבי מוסר; 1QH^a 10.14) would appear to be dependent upon Proverbs 12.1a, which states that 'whoever loves instruction loves knowledge' (אהב מוסר אהב דעת).¹¹⁴ Terms such as 'mediator', 'knowledge' and 'instruction' all imply a context of teaching behind the passage. The speaker, as 'a mediator of knowledge', performs a didactic role within a group who are characterised by truth (אמת; 1QH^a 10.14 / נבח; 10.15), instruction (מוסר; 10.14) and, most significantly, righteousness (צדק; 10.13), while 'mediators of error' (מל"צי תעות; 10.14) would thus appear in the role of false teachers. Small wonder then that many have associated the author of this passage with the figure elsewhere described as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק; see n.109 above).

Further to such an identification, André Dupont-Sommer notes that the speaker refers to himself as 'a banner' (נס; 1QH^a 10.13), the closest comparative use of which is Isaiah 11.10 where the 'root of Jesse' is similarly described (Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.205, n.3). Thus Dupont-Sommer attributes a messianic claim to the speaker (a role we have likewise associated with the anticipated 'Yoreh ha-Caddiq' of the FSL; cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23 – 13.1). Svend Holm-Nielsen regards Dupont-Sommer's assumption as "rash" (1960, p.35, n.27), though it is intriguing, with regard to the possible applicability of Isaiah 11.10 to the 'teacher', that נס in that text appears in the immediate context of 'seeking' (דרש; 1QH^a 10.13).

¹¹³ In this context it is perhaps significant to note that מל"ץ ('mediator') comes from the root ל"ץ, from which לצון ('scoffing') is also derived (cf. Richardson 1955; also Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995). Though no especial negative connotations can *here* be inferred (the protagonist is also designated מל"ץ, albeit one of 'knowledge'), might such negatively associated mediation (found also in similar phrases to be examined in due course) have had any influence on the use of לצון to describe one such false teacher in the Damascus Document?

¹¹⁴ On 'knowledge' in the Hodayot, see Mansoor 1961, pp.65-74.

Isaiah 11.10) and ‘a remnant’ (שאר; Isaiah 11.11), both similarly important themes in the Damascus Document.¹¹⁵

Despite the didactic role of the speaker, provided furthermore for ‘the elect of righteousness’ (בחירי צדק; cf. יודעי צדק in CD 1.1), we can yet again make no clear affirmation of identity with the figure described elsewhere as ‘a teacher of righteousness’.¹¹⁶ More pertinently for our study however, the thematic content of the passage (in particular the conflict between, and reception of, two types of mediation) may yet cast light on our perceived developmental process.

1QH^a 12.23b-25a [4.23b-25a]

It is with regard to the potential significance of such thematic content that we shall briefly consider a further passage which, despite an absence of discernible sobriquet-related elements, contains instances of related terminology which may prove informative:

^{12.23}And you have not covered in shame the faces of ²⁴all those sought {הנדרשנים} by me, those who gather ^ח to your covenant. And they have listened to me, those who walk in the way of your heart {ההולכים בדרך לבבה}, and have aligned themselves for you ²⁵in the council of the holy ones {קדושים}. (1QH^a 12.23b-25a) [= Sukenik 4.23b-25a]

This comes from another of the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’ attributed to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’. Though the identity of the author may be beyond our ability to affirm, a number of elements here *are* reminiscent of the context in which ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מורה צדק) is introduced to us in CD 1.11a.

¹¹⁵ Not to mention the association with צדק (Isaiah 11.4, 5) and דעת (Isaiah 11.2). It is perhaps also worthy of note that the speaker in our present text refers to himself as ‘a man of dispute’ (איש ריב; 1QH^a 10.14; cf. Jeremiah 15.10), ריב being another prominent theme in the Damascus Document (e.g. CD 1.2; 1.21; 14.12). Cf. the use of ריב in 1QH^a 13.22 in the context of צדק, יחד, and בריח.

¹¹⁶ Though, as Callaway points out: “The language of this psalm does induce one to think of the one praying as the leader or role model for a group of righteous ones who are opposed by a group of wicked persons” (1988, p.191).

The act of seeking (שׁוֹרֵץ) is present both in CD 1.10-11 (cf. 6.6-11; Hosea 10.12) and in 1QH^a 12.24 (though significantly not of God here) and of course the theme of ‘covenant’ is prevalent throughout the Damascus Document (often in association with the ‘teacher’; cf. CD 1.1 – 2.3; 6.2 – 7.1; 19.33 – 20.34). More interesting however is the claim that those who have listened to the speaker are ‘those who walk in the way of your heart’ (1QH^a 12.24). The glossed Damascus Document, belonging to the ESL, specifically assigns the guidance of such a group to ‘a teacher of righteousness’:

¹¹⁰But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him with a whole heart, ¹¹and he raised up for them a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart {להדריךכם בדרך לבו}. (CD 1.10-11a)

Indeed, listening to the voice of this teacher is lauded in CD 20.27-34 and associated with אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְחָד (‘the Men of the Community’; cf. אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְחָד; 1QS 9.10).¹¹⁷ It is of some significance perhaps then that חָדָר has been inserted above the line in 1QH^a 12.24.¹¹⁸ Furthermore, those who have listened to the speaker and ‘walk in the way of your heart’ are said to have aligned themselves ‘in the council of the holy ones {קְדוּשִׁים}’ (1QH^a 12.25).¹¹⁹ It is tempting here to recall ‘the holy anointed ones’ (מְשִׁיחֵי הַקֹּדֶשׁ) of CD 6.1, to whom the anticipated יוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק of the FSL was to be an eschatological successor (CD 6.11).¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ See n.24 and n.26 above.

¹¹⁸ García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate accordingly: ‘those who unite /together/ for your covenant’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; cf. García Martínez 1996). Wise, Abegg and Cook translate similarly, though suggest ‘in the Yahad’ as a possible alternative (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Note Nehemiah 6.2 (נוֹעַדָה יַחְדָּו); cf. Mansoor 1961, p.127, n.6.

¹¹⁹ Transcribed in error by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) as קְדוּשִׁים. Cf. בְּסוֹד־קְדוּשִׁים in Psalms 89.8.

¹²⁰ On קְדוּשִׁים as ‘holy ones’ or ‘saints’, especially with regard to non-human entities (e.g. the heavenly court), see Kim 1985, pp.193-210. Menahem Mansoor points out that קְדוּשִׁים could also be taken to indicate ‘angels’ (so too Collins 1992, pp.613-614), though suggests that in the context of 1QH^a 12.25 it may refer to “members of the sect themselves” (Mansoor 1961, p.127, n.9). Kim likewise notes that where holiness is applied to humans in a scriptural context, it is “mostly to the community as a whole or the group who are close and loyal to God” (Kim 1985, p.205).

It would certainly be possible to *infer* the presence of the Damascus Document's 'Teacher of the Community' behind this text (e.g. the themes of 'seeking', 'covenant', alignment with 'the holy ones', and more specifically the association with **רַחֵם** and the importance of 'those who walk in the way of your heart' listening to the speaker's voice).¹²¹ However, just because it is possible does not necessarily mean we would be justified to do so. Even if a direct correspondence between 1QH^a 12.23b-25a and the Damascus Document could be demonstrated, we must not preclude the possibility that the former informed the Yahadic redaction of the latter (in the same manner that Davies considers the Hodayot to have likewise influenced the portrayal of the 'teacher' in the pesharim; 1987, pp.87-105). Thus the identity of the speaker in this passage remains enigmatic, though we can acknowledge the presence of terminological and thematic elements which elsewhere pertain to descriptions of the 'teacher'.

1QH^a 16.16-17 [8.16-17]

One final passage from the Hodayot to be considered with regard to the sobriquet **מורה הצדיק** is from column 16 of the re-ordered 1QH^a:

^{16.16}But you, my God, you have placed in my mouth as it were an early rain {**כִּיּוֹרָה**}, a shower for all [...] and a spring of living water. And the heavens will not fail {**לֹא יִכְזֹב**} to open, ¹⁷they will not stop but will become a stream overflowing up[on ...] water and to the seas without e[nd]. (1QH^a 16.16-17) [= Sukenik 8.16-17]

This passage is again in the first-person and assigned by Gert Jeremias among the 'Teacher Hymns' (see n.109 above). The speaker claims that God has placed 'an early rain' (**יּוֹרָה**) in his mouth, a metaphor that is extended to encompass 'a spring of living water' (**מִבּוֹעַ מַיִם חַיִּים**; 1QH^a 16.16) and other water imagery. It is hard not to see here the same dual understanding of **רַחֵם** employed in the

¹²¹ Even the negative assertion 'And you have not covered {**מַחֲתֵהָ**} in shame' (1QH^a 12.23b) utilises the same word **מַחֵח** borrowed from Ezekiel 13 and employed in the Damascus Document in reference to the 'daubers of whitewash' who follow false prophets (CD 8.12: **מַחֵי הַתַּפֵּל**; 19.25: **מַחֵי תַּפֵּל**). Cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.84, n.53.

FSL where it finds expression in the expectation of ‘one who will teach righteousness {יורה הצדק} at the end of days’ (CD 6.11a), drawing upon Hosea 10.12 (cf. Joel 2.23). Hence perhaps the specific placement of ‘an early rain’ *in his mouth* (בפי; 1QH^a 16.16)? The metaphor would appear to play on this dual understanding and it is in fact *teaching* that is implied as having been placed in the speaker’s mouth.¹²²

Such an understanding has two important implications. Firstly, we may be given to wonder whether the speaker is deliberately applying the professed expectation of CD 6.11a to himself and thus tacitly laying claim to the role. Secondly, we may note that he is claiming divine authority for his teaching; the words in his mouth have been placed there by God.¹²³ Dupont-Sommer, who believes the speaker to be identical with the ‘teacher’, goes further, suggesting that he is here intentionally alluding to “the title by which he was known by his followers” (1961, p.228, n.1), which, in Dupont-Sommer’s opinion, was מורה הצדק. Given that our analysis so far would appear to indicate that the sobriquet מורה הצדק was not in use in the ESL, this would seem unlikely. On the other hand, an allusion to the title יורה היחיד / מורה (CD 20.1; 20.14) would be possible and certainly some reference to the activity of teaching is implied (congruent with the didactic role implicit in the description ‘a mediator of knowledge’; 1QH^a 10.13).

In the present passage, יורה is ostensibly used to indicate ‘an early rain’ (cf. the abundant water imagery throughout 1QH^a 16.4-26), indicative perhaps of a dependence upon scriptural usage such as Hosea 10.12 or Joel 2.23 (Bengtsson 2000a, pp.192, 194; Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.228, n.1; Holm-Nielsen 1960,

¹²² Wise, Abegg and Cook render this implicit meaning *explicit* in their rather loose translation, supplying the qualifying phrase ‘your words’ (‘But You, O my God, have placed Your words in my mouth, as showers of early rain’). In their opinion, the intention of 1QH^a 16.16 is to present the speaker as “a mouthpiece for God’s words” (1996, p.85). Cf. 1QH^a 19.33: ‘And you have placed in the mouth of your servant thanksgiving’ (והשם בפי עבדכה הודות). Also, Numbers 22.38 and 2 Samuel 14.3 (see Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.153, n.31).

¹²³ Bengtsson 2000a, p.198; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996, p.85.

p.153, n.32), yet with metaphorical undertones playing on the ambiguity of יִרְה.¹²⁴ In other words, 1QH^a 16.16-17 is adopting a scriptural term that may be taken to indicate either ‘an early rain’ or the act of teaching, and employing it in such a way as to bring out *both* meanings within the text. Hence we have here an interpretation of the term akin to that of CD 6.11a. That the latter text belongs to the FSL (and we can perhaps assume was available to the author of 1QH^a 16.16-17) lends further credence to our proposal above that the speaker is drawing upon CD 6.11a and, by implication, claiming (with divine authority) the role of the anticipated יִרְה הַצֶּדֶק.¹²⁵

Other elements of this passage have a similarly distinctive sectarian character. The metaphor regarding the ‘early rain’ placed in the mouth of the speaker is extended to encompass ‘a spring of living water’ (מְבוֹעַ מַיִם חַיִּים; 1QH^a 16.16).¹²⁶ We have already seen a similar phrase occur in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document:

^{19.33}Thus all the men who entered the new ³⁴covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living water {בְּאֵר מַיִם חַיִּים} ³⁵shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written from the day of the gathering in of מוֹרֶה הַיַּחֲדָד^{20.1} until there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel. (CD 19.33b – 20.1a)

There, departure from the (new) covenant entails departure from ‘the well of living water’, seemingly representative of the מוֹרֶה and teachings of the group (cf. CD 3.12b-16; 6.2-5). Might such an understanding lie behind 1QH^a 16.16? It would follow that we should similarly regard ‘a spring of living water’ in the

¹²⁴ With regard to scriptural influence and typologies, see further Daise 2000 (esp. pp.297-305).

¹²⁵ We have already speculated, in both the present chapter and previously in Chapter Two, that the figure acclaimed as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ in the ESL was considered the fulfilment of the expectation professed in the FSL regarding יִרְה הַצֶּדֶק בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים (CD 6.11a). If such a claim can indeed be recognised in 1QH^a 16.16, expressed furthermore in the first-person, greater weight may perhaps be given to the identification of the (implied) author with this figure.

¹²⁶ Mansoor draws attention to Isaiah 35.7 (Mansoor 1961, p.155, n.4), but this has only מְבוֹעַי. Cf. Jeremiah 2.13: ‘a fountain of living water’ (מִקְוֵה מַיִם חַיִּים).

Hodayot as a metaphorical reference to a source of knowledge. Interestingly, 1QH^a 10.17b-18 states of the speaker's opponents:

^{10.17}They throw into the pit the life of the man in whose mouth {בפי(ו)} you have established and imparted understanding. ¹⁸You placed it in his heart to open a fountain of knowledge {מקור דעת} for all those who understand. (1QH^a 10.17b-18) [= Sukenik 2.17b-18]¹²⁷

The phrase 'a fountain of knowledge' (מקור דעת) appears also in 1QH^a 20.29, while our present passage mentions 'a fountain of life' (מקור חיים; 1QH^a 16.14; cf. Jeremiah 2.13: 'a fountain of living water'; מקור מים חיים).¹²⁸ Furthermore, 1QH^a 23[top].10 states 'You have opened a [foun]tain in the mouth of your servant' (נמקור פתחתה בפי עבדכה).¹²⁹ The mesh of similar phraseology, both scriptural and sectarian (in particular the use of באר מים החיים in CD 19.34; cf. 3.12b-16; 6.2-5) provides some justification for regarding the 'spring of living water' (מבוע מים חיים) of 1QH^a 16.16 in reference to a metaphorical 'fountain of knowledge' (מקור דעת; 1QH^a 10.18; 20.29). This would in turn appear to provide independent confirmation of our analogous interpretation of יורה as an allusion to teaching.

It is perhaps significant that 1QH^a 16.16-17 is set within the wider context of a planting metaphor (1QH^a 16.4-26; cf. 14.14-19). The use of שורש ('root'; 1QH^a 16.7, 10, 23) and מטע ('planting'; 1QH^a 16.5, 6, 9, 10, 13, 20, 21) recall the 'root of planting' (שורש מטעת) of the Damascus Document (CD 1.7), there

¹²⁷ The text actually preserves בפי, as at 1QH^a 16.16 (both texts likewise contain שמחה; though here qualified by בל בבו), though most scholars correct to בפיו (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004). Svend Holm-Nielsen, however, warns against such corrections (1960, pp.36-37, n.40) and so retains בפי, translating 'through my mouth' (similarly García Martínez 1996; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

¹²⁸ Cf. 'The words of a man's mouth {דברי פי־אִשׁ} are deep waters; the fountain of wisdom {מקור חכמה} is a gushing stream' (Proverbs 18.4).

¹²⁹ Cf. 1QH^a 19.33: 'And you have placed in the mouth of your servant thanksgiving' (ותשם בפי עבדכה הודות).

used to designate the group responsible for the text.¹³⁰ The language of 1QH^a 16.4-26 draws upon themes from Ezekiel 31 (cf. Isaiah 60.21; 61.3) and contributes to a body of planting imagery found among the Qumran-related texts (Dimant 1984, p.539; Fujita 1976; Hempel 1999a, p.329, n.36; Stuckenbruck 2005; Tiller 1997).¹³¹ Patrick Tiller notes the following of 1QH^a 16.4-26:

The images seem internally inconsistent and intermixed with inconsistent sorts of references by the psalmist to himself. ... The textual confusion and intermixture of poet and metaphor indicates that the writer felt that he participated in the planting or growth of the shoot that was to become an eternal plant of global proportions. (Tiller 1997, p.332)¹³²

Such an insight may prove to be of particular note if we were to accredit authorship to the figure described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מורה צדק) who we are told was ‘raised up’ for ‘a root of planting’ in CD 1.4-11a.¹³³

One last point worth mentioning with regard to 1QH^a 16.16-17 is the presence of the negative לא יכזב indicating that ‘the heavens will not fail {לא יכזב} to open’ (1QH^a 16.16-17). It appears in form and context to draw upon Isaiah 58.11b:

and you shall be like a watered garden, like a spring of water, whose waters never fail {אשר לא יכזבו מימיו}. (Isaiah 58.11b)

It is however derived from the root כזב which can also mean ‘lie’ as we find in, for example, מטִיף כזב.¹³⁴ Indeed the form found in Isaiah 58.11b, pointed

¹³⁰ See n.19 and n.20 above.

¹³¹ Cf. Daise 2000.

¹³² See further, Charlesworth 1991.

¹³³ Note the use of יחד, albeit in the sense of ‘together’, within the planting metaphor of 1QH^a 16.4-26 (1QH^a 16.5). Dupont-Sommer attempts to identify further sectarian terminology within the passage, reconstructing ‘the sons of men’ or ‘the sons of righteousness’ in the lacuna at 1QH^a 16.16 (Dupont-Sommer 1961, p.228, n.1; cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.153, n.33). In addition, rather than ‘heavens’ (השמים; 1QH^a 16.17), he elects to reconstruct ‘princes’ (השנים), thus drawing a parallel with the ‘princes’ who dug the well and sought God in CD 6.2-11a (cf. 1QH^a 14.14), an approach in which he has not been followed (1961, p.228, n.3; cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.153, n.34).

יִכְזְבוּ, appears only once more in the Hebrew Bible, where it is rendered ‘they lied’ by the *NRSV* (Psalms 78.36).¹³⁵ The phrase לֹא יִכְזֹב appears in Proverbs 14.5 and Habakkuk 2.3, both times most aptly translated ‘does not lie’.¹³⁶ Though perhaps by accident rather than design, the proximity of the roots יָרָה and כִּזַּב in 1QH^a 16.16 do bring to mind the terminology of opposition between ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מֹרֶה צֶדֶק) and ‘a spouter of a lie’ (מְטִיף כִּזָּב). Though it would go far beyond the evidence to suggest a deliberate allusion, in this context it is perhaps interesting to recall the description in CD 1.14-15 of one who ‘spouted to Israel *waters of a lie*’ (הַטִּיף לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִיְמֵי כִזָּב).

Summary

The sobriquet ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק) does not appear in the H-material in either definite or indefinite form. Neither is the label ‘the Teacher of the Community’ employed. Given the frequency with which the text is attributed to the historical ‘teacher’ (see n.109 above), it is arguably peculiar that none of the designations attributed to this figure in the D-material (FSL or ESL) appear here.¹³⁷ Håkan Bengtsson, assuming authorship by the ‘teacher’, suggests that since the title ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ is absent:

Consequently, it was not a self-designation. It is likely that the title was adopted and applied to him by the *Yahad*. (Bengtsson 2000a, p.195)

Such an interpretation however is grounded in the supposition that the speaker of the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’ was in fact the figure to whom the title מֹרֶה

¹³⁴ Cf. Clines (ed.) 1998; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

¹³⁵ ‘But they flattered him with their mouths, they lied to him {יִכְזְבוּ-לּוֹ} with their tongues’ (Psalms 78.36).

¹³⁶ ‘A faithful witness does not lie {לֹא יִכְזֹב}, but a false witness breathes out lies’ (Proverbs 14.5); ‘For there is still a vision for the appointed time; it speaks of the end, and does not lie {וְלֹא יִכְזֹב}’ (Habakkuk 2.3). Cf. Numbers 23.19.

¹³⁷ Mansoor similarly notes the apparent absence of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ from the Hodayot as problematic for the assumption of authorship by this figure (1961, p.45).

הַצִּדִּיק was eventually applied. Most scholars have attempted to establish this by a comparison of apparent ‘historical’ events which befall ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ in the pesharim with those experienced by the protagonist of the Hodayot.¹³⁸ However, as Bonnie Kittel notes:

Attractive as this view is, it is built on a fallacious assumption and circular argument. ...many scholars have concluded that since the Teacher of Righteousness is described as suffering and persecuted, and the author of the Hodayot also speaks of suffering, the two must be the same. Once having made this identification, they see the distresses related in these psalms as events in the life of the Teacher, and thus affirm by this circular argument that he wrote them. (Kittel 1981, pp.9-10)

We have already seen that Davies has similarly cast doubt upon the validity of such an approach, highlighting the apparent dependence of the pesharim upon the Hodayot for information concerning the ‘teacher’ (and thus explaining the similarity in content between the two).¹³⁹ Davies’ suggestion is convincingly demonstrated, though carries with it the significant implication that:

within the Qumran community these hymns – and at the very least the autobiographical ones – were *understood* to be compositions of the ‘Teacher’. (Davies 1987, pp.89-90; my italics)¹⁴⁰

Thus designations or descriptions within the Hodayot may likewise have been understood as applicable to the ‘teacher’ and, even if not influenced by, may have fed *into* the process of sobriquet development.

¹³⁸ Cf. n.109 above.

¹³⁹ Davies 1987, pp.87-105.

¹⁴⁰ The assertion by Michael Knibb that he cannot find any evidence for this conclusion (Knibb 1990, p.54) would suggest both a denial, in his opinion, of literary dependency upon the Hodayot by the pesharim *and* that the community who read the scrolls distinguished between ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ as presented in the pesharim and the often near-identical descriptions of the protagonist of the Hodayot. The affinity between the two must surely suggest either (i) some form of literary dependency, (ii) an independent source upon which both drew, or, as many scholars would have it, (iii) that the two contain largely concurring (auto)biographical details concerning the life of an historical individual. Each of these possibilities entails the conclusion that the protagonist of the Hodayot was *understood* to be the ‘teacher’. At the very least, even if the pesharim were written concerning a distinct individual and without regard for the Hodayot, modern scholars were quick to spot the points of contact between these two shadowy figures; would readers in the community not have done the same and thus read the ‘teacher’ within the Hodayot?

The description of ‘the righteous (one)’ (צַדִּיק; e.g. 1QH^a 7.18) and the protagonist’s portrayal of himself within a didactic role as ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (מִלֵּיץ דַּעַת) for the ‘elect of righteousness’ (בַּחֲרֵי צֶדֶק; 1QH^a 10.13) are in keeping with the description of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document.¹⁴¹ Further descriptive elements in the Hodayot, such as association with the term יָחַד (e.g. 1QH^a 6.18; 12.24; 13.22; 16.5), the ‘spring of living water’ (מִבּוֹעַ מַיִם חַיִּים; 1QH^a 16.16) and use of a planting metaphor (1QH^a 16.4-26; cf. 14.14-19), are similarly paralleled in this text. Even more striking is the claim that ‘those who walk in the way of your heart’ (הַהוֹלְכִים בְּדֶרֶךְ לִבְכָּה; 1QH^a 12.24) have ‘listened’ to the protagonist of the Hodayot (יְשׁוּמְעוֹנִי; 12.24), while in the Damascus Document the figure labelled ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (whose voice must be listened to; CD 20.27-34) is expressly described as having been raised up for a remnant by God ‘to lead them in the way of his heart’ (לְהַדְרִיכֵם בְּדֶרֶךְ לִבּוֹ; CD 1.11).

Perhaps most significantly for our examination though is the use and application of the term יוֹרֶה by the speaker in 1QH^a 16.16-17. The context would suggest a deliberate metaphorical use, playing on the ambiguity with regard to ‘raining’ and ‘teaching’ as alternative understandings of the root יָרָה and employing the term in such a way as to bring out both meanings within the text. Hence we have here an interpretation of יוֹרֶה akin to that of CD 6.11a. We have even tentatively suggested that 1QH^a 16.16-17 might represent an effort on the part of the speaker to claim identification with the anticipated יוֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק of the FSL.¹⁴² Given the apparent application of this role to ‘the Teacher of the Community’ in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (resulting in his description as ‘a teacher of righteousness’; מוֹרֶה צֶדֶק; CD 1.11; 20.32) and furthermore the association of this figure with the protagonist of the Hodayot (see

¹⁴¹ See in particular, CD 1.1 – 2.1; 19.33 – 20.34; cf. 6.2-11.

¹⁴² Cf. n.125 above.

n.140 above), such an approach might prove to reveal a crucial step in the development of the sobriquet **מורה הצדק**.

3.2.2.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’

1QH^a 10.9b-11 [2.9b-11]

Various designations and descriptions abound in the Hodayot for groups of opponents. It is perhaps significant that these are largely to be found within the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’ and thus denote, for the most part, opponents of the protagonist. Whether any of these might be said to bear relation to the sobriquet **מטיף הכזב** remains to be seen. The first passage we shall examine concerns a group of ‘scoffers’:

^{10,9}And you have set me as a reproach ¹⁰and a mockery to traitors {בוגרים}, a foundation of truth and insight to the upright of way {ישרי דרך}. And I have become, because of the iniquity of the wicked {רשעים}, ¹¹slander on the lip of violent men, scoffers {לצים} gnash their teeth. (1QH^a 10.9b-11) [= Sukenik 2.9b-11]

The term **לצים**, the plural of **לץ**, comes from the root **לץ**. This is the same root from which **מליץ** (‘mediator’, as in **מליצי תעות**; 1QH^a 10.14) is derived (see Richardson 1955).¹⁴³ The same is also true of **לצון** (‘scoffing’), employed in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document in reference to ‘the Men of Scoffing’ (**אנשי הלצון**; CD 20.11) and, crucially, ‘the Man of Scoffing {איש הלצון} who spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ (CD 1.14-15).¹⁴⁴ Thus we shall, with the majority of scholars, render **לצים** as ‘scoffers’ (e.g. García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).¹⁴⁵

¹⁴³ Though note also **מליץ דעת** (1QH^a 10.13). Cf. Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

¹⁴⁴ See n.113 above.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. ‘mockers’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961); ‘scorners’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960); ‘babblers’ (Richardson 1955). Richardson in particular outlines a convincing argument on the grounds of context for an understanding of **לץ** and its derivatives within scripture in reference to ‘talking

Of the various scriptural occurrences of לְצִיִּים, two are of especial note.

Proverbs 1.22 reads:

How long, O simple ones, will you love being simple? How long will scoffers {לְצִיִּים} delight in their scoffing {לְצוֹן} and fools hate knowledge? (Proverbs 1.22)

It thus demonstrates a close association between לְצִיִּים (as found here in 1QH^a 10.11) and לְצוֹן (employed as אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן and אִנְשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן in CD 1.14; 20.11).

Even more intriguing is the appearance of לְצִיִּים in Proverbs 19.22-29:

^{19.22}What is desirable in a person is loyalty, and it is better to be poor than a man of a lie {אִישׁ כֹּזֵב}. ²³The fear of the LORD is life indeed; filled with it one rests secure and suffers no harm. ²⁴The lazy person buries a hand in the dish, and will not even bring it back to the mouth. ²⁵Strike a scoffer {לִיץ}, and the simple will learn prudence; reprove the intelligent, and they will gain knowledge {דַּעַת}. ²⁶Those who do violence to their father and chase away their mother are children who cause shame and bring reproach. ²⁷Cease straying, my child, from the words of knowledge {אִמְרֵי־דַעַת}, in order that you may hear instruction {מוֹסֵר}. ²⁸A worthless witness mocks {יִלְיִץ} at justice, and the mouth of the wicked {רָשָׁעִים} devours iniquity. ²⁹Condemnation is ready for scoffers {לְצִיִּים}, and flogging for the backs of fools. (Proverbs 19.22-29)

References to ‘scoffers’ (including the use of לְצִיִּים) here appear in the context of ‘a man of a lie’ (אִישׁ כֹּזֵב; note the absence of the definite article), reminiscent of the association in the Damascus Document of אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן with אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב (CD 1.11b-17) and אִנְשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן (20.10-15).¹⁴⁶ Furthermore, reference to the ‘wicked’ (רָשָׁעִים; Proverbs 19.28) and their iniquity (אֵו) recalls that of 1QH^a 10.10 (though note עוֹן, not אֵו), while, as we have seen, ‘knowledge’ (דַּעַת; Proverbs

freely’ and the noun ‘babblers’, concepts that would tie-in also with the notion of ‘spouting’ (cf. אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן who spouted {הִטִּיף} to Israel waters of a lie; CD 1.14-15). Nevertheless, some wider range of meaning for the derivatives of לִיץ would appear necessary (e.g. מְלִיץ, which Richardson concedes may on occasion be in reference to mediation, as indeed we translated above; Richardson 1955, p.167) and so, to make explicit the relationship to אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן (CD 1.14) and אִנְשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן (CD 20.11), we shall follow the majority of scholars in rendering לְצִיִּים ‘scoffers’.

¹⁴⁶ See n.76 above.

19.25, 27) and ‘instruction’ (מוֹסֵר; 19.27) likewise appear just a few lines later in 1QH^a 10.13-14.¹⁴⁷ Though there is nothing to suggest a direct dependence of 1QH^a 10.9b-11 upon Proverbs 19.22-29, there is evidence of a contextually similar understanding of לְצִיִּים.

There would also appear to be points of contact between 1QH^a 10.9b-11 and the redacted first column of CD. In the latter, a figure described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ is raised up by God ‘to lead them in the way {בְּדֶרֶךְ} of his heart’ (CD 1.11a) but is set in opposition to ‘a congregation of traitors’ (עֲדָתָם; CD 1.12), ‘those who departed from the way’ (הֵם סָרִי דֶרֶךְ; CD 1.13), led by ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן; CD 1.14; cf. אִנְשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן; CD 20.11).¹⁴⁸ In our present text, 1QH^a 10.9b-11, the protagonist has been established by God for ‘the upright of way’ (יִשְׂרֵי דֶרֶךְ; 1QH^a 10.10) but is likewise opposed by ‘traitors’ (בּוֹגְדִים; 1QH^a 10.10) and ‘scoffers’ (לְצִיִּים; 1QH^a 10.11). Is it possible to perceive a link here between the ‘scoffers’ of the Hodayot and those of the Damascus Document, in particular ‘the Man of Scoffing’ who we have seen described as ‘a spouter of a lie’ (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26)?

That לְצִיִּים and בּוֹגְדִים appear only once in 1QH^a, and are to be found within the same passage (10.9b-11), lends credence to the suggestion of some relationship with the Damascus Document, where the two themes are also brought into association in the redaction of the text belonging to this ESL (CD 1.11b-17). However, the use of slightly differing terminology with regard to ‘scoffers’ might warn against too close an identification. The designation אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן (CD 1.14; cf. אִנְשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן; CD 20.11), as we have already noted, would appear in context and form to draw upon Isaiah 28.14 (אִנְשֵׁי לְצוֹן), while לְצִיִּים

¹⁴⁷ Mansoor suggests reading עֵין for עוֹן at 1QH^a 10.10 (1961, p.106, n.2). Holm-Nielsen disagrees however, regarding such a rendering as contextually incongruent (1960, p.35, n.22).

¹⁴⁸ Note also the role of ‘the wicked’ (רָשָׁע) as a foil to ‘the righteous’ in CD 1.19 (belonging originally to the FSL, as does the עֲדָת בּוֹגְדִים; CD 1.12).

(1QH^a 10.11) has more in common with occurrences of the same term throughout Proverbs.¹⁴⁹ In addition, the Hodayot would appear to draw heavily upon Proverbs (and to a lesser extent Psalms) for the opposition of צדיק and רשע (see n.99 above). Phillip Callaway notes:

The consistent use of comparison suggests that the speaker is not trying to communicate specific historical information about his adversaries. (Callaway 1988, p.195)

The most we can say for the present is that both the Hodayot and the Damascus Document share a general theme that portrays figures of opposition in the role of ‘scoffers’; a theme that is founded in scriptural texts.

While the צי"ל of 1QH^a 10.9b-11 would thus appear a general label applicable to any opposition met by the protagonist, the title אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן found in CD 1.14 is used in a far narrower sense (e.g. its association with specific deeds; CD 1.11-17; cf. 20.10-15). It would be unlikely therefore that we have in 1QH^a 10.9b-11 an oblique reference to ‘the Man of Scoffing’, though a movement in the other direction would be possible.¹⁵⁰ Given however our conclusion that the protagonist may *retrospectively* have been identified with the ‘teacher’ (see n.140 above), we may tentatively postulate that ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (‘a spouter of a lie’; CD 1.14-15; cf. 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26) and ‘the Men of Scoffing’ (CD 20.10) might also have been retrospectively ‘identified’ within this passage. While therefore of limited use for our investigation of sobriquet development, 1QH^a 10.9b-11 does highlight the prominence of a more general theme that portrays figures of opposition as ‘scoffers’, present in two distinct texts of the ESL. This may indicate additional reasoning for the employment of the

¹⁴⁹ In fact, three out of the four scriptural occurrences of צי"ל, and eleven out of twelve of the singular form צל, are to be found in Proverbs (the exceptions being Psalms 1.1 and Isaiah 29.20 respectively). Note however the use of אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן in Proverbs 29.8 (see n.45 above).

¹⁵⁰ Indeed, Davies’ examination of the pesharim’s dependence upon the Hodayot highlighted “a more general phenomenon, whereby rather vaguer plural terms in the Hymns become sobriquets for discrete individuals, or for identifiable parties, in the pesharim” (1987, p.97). This itself is something we shall evaluate in due course, though one is given to wonder whether the insight might also apply to the relationship between the Hodayot and the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document.

designation *איש הל צון* in CD 1.14. As to this figure's further characterisation as 'a spouter of a lie' (*מטיף כזב*; CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26), 1QH^a 10.9b-11 reveals very little.

1QH^a 10.13-17a [2.13-17a]

A further passage of note, examined already with regard to the sobriquet *מורה הצדק*, appears two lines further down in the same column:

^{10.13}But you have set me like a banner to the elect of righteousness, and a mediator of knowledge {מליין דעת} of wonderful mysteries, to test ¹⁴[the men of] truth and to try those who love instruction. And I have become a man of dispute {ריב} to מליצי תעות [but a man of ¹⁵pea]ce to all seers of truth {נבוחות}. And I have become a spirit of zeal against חל[קות] דורשי חל. ¹⁶[All] אנשי רמיה roar against me like the sound of the turbulence of many waters and schemes of Belial are [all] ¹⁷their thoughts. (1QH^a 10.13-17a) [= Sukenik 2.13-17a]

The speaker, 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליין דעת; 1QH^a 10.13), is here opposed by 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות; 1QH^a 10.14).¹⁵¹ Reference is also made to אנשי רמיה, which we shall render with the majority of scholars, 'men of deceit' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Holm-Nielsen 1960; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Mansoor 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).¹⁵² Both descriptions entail a sense of falsehood, made more explicit by the contrasting presence in the passage of 'a mediator of knowledge' and '[men of] truth' (אנשי [אמת]; 1QH^a 10.14). Indeed, with regard to 'mediators of error', we have already noted by token of its juxtaposition with the implied didactic role of 'a mediator of knowledge', that it would appear to indicate false teachers.

Though neither *נטיף* nor *כזב* are attested in the passage, some similarities exist with associated terminology in the redacted first column of CD. Despite the

¹⁵¹ See n.112 above.

¹⁵² Note however, 'the deceivers' (Vermes 2004) and 'arrogant men' (García Martínez 1996). Also, while here providing 'men of deceit', García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) translate אנשי רמיה at 1QH^a 6.14 as 'men of guile'. See רמה in Koehler and Baumgartner 1996. Cf. אנשי הרמיה in 1QS 9.8.

fact that מל'צי תעות and variant derogatory forms (to be examined below) are to be found in the Hodayot, Michael Douglas notes the uniqueness of this construction:

In Jewish literature, the expression מל'צי + pejorative noun is *only* found within 1QH cols 10-14. (Douglas 1999, p.249; my italics)

However, as we have already remarked, מל'יץ ('mediator') comes from the root ל'יץ, from which לצון ('scoffing') is also derived, a term used to describe the false teacher of CD 1.13-15 who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (cf. Richardson 1955; see n.113 above). It is of further note that the qualification of such mediation in 1QH^a 10.14 is תעות, here rendered 'error'. The root תעה can additionally mean 'to go astray' (Koehler and Baumgartner 1999; cf. Exodus 23.4) and significantly is *also* used of this figure in CD 1.13-15:

^{1.13}That was the time about which it is written, "like a stray heifer, ¹⁴so Israel strayed", when arose the Man of Scoffing {איש הלצון} who spouted to Israel ¹⁵waters of a lie and led them astray {תעם} in a wilderness without a way (CD 1.13-15).

Thus both elements of מל'צי תעות are found in some form in the terminology used to describe one 'who spouted to Israel waters of a lie' in the Damascus Document.

We have similarly noted the presence of ר'ב at 1QH^a 10.14, also appearing in the first column of CD (CD 1.2; 1.21; see n.115 above), and the use of צדק (1QH^a 10.13; cf. CD 1.1, 11, 16, 19, 20). In addition, דורשי חל[קות] (1QH^a 10.15) is paralleled by דרשו בחלקות (CD 1.18).¹⁵³ There is accordingly a significant contextual overlap between the employment of מל'צי תעות in the Hodayot and the description of one 'who spouted to Israel waters of a lie' in the Damascus Document.

¹⁵³ We shall examine this designation in greater detail in Chapter Five.

The descriptions ‘mediators of error’ (מלִיצֵי תַעוּת; 1QH^a 10.14) and ‘men of deceit’ (אֲנָשִׁי רַמְיָה; 1QH^a 10.16) have an inherent association with falsehood.¹⁵⁴ The former in particular shares with our sobriquet, ‘the Spouter of the Lie’, the concept of false teaching. These designations thus have much in common on a thematic level at least, if not a strictly terminological one, with the sobriquet מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב. Along with their counterparts (מלִיצֵי דַעַת; [אֲנָשִׁי] אֲמָת), they mirror the distinction within the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document between the two types of teaching represented by ‘a spouter of a lie’ and ‘a teacher of righteousness’.

1QH^a 10.31b-34a [2.31b-34a]

Similar terminology to that employed in 1QH^a 10.13-17a appears in a passage towards the bottom of the same column:

^{10.31}And you have saved me from the zeal of מלִיצֵי כֹזֵב³² and from the congregation of דֹּרְשֵׁי חֲלָקוֹת. You have redeemed the life of the poor one whom they thought to finish off, spilling his blood³³ because he served you. But they did [not kn]ow that my steps come from you. And they have set me as an object of contempt³⁴ and reproach in the mouth of all דֹּרְשֵׁי רַמְיָה. (1QH^a 10.31b-34a) [= Sukenik 2.31b-34a]

We have noted already the insight of Douglas with regard to the unusual nature of the construction מלִיצֵי followed by a pejorative noun, a construction limited within Jewish literature to 1QH^a 10-14 (Douglas 1999, p.249). In this passage, rather than מלִיצֵי תַעוּת (1QH^a 10.14), we have מלִיצֵי כֹזֵב (1QH^a 10.31). This has been rendered variously as ‘mediators of deceit’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), ‘mediators of lies’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996), ‘interpreters of lies’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Knibb 1994a), ‘interpreters of falsehood’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961), ‘lying interpreters’ (Vermes 2004), ‘spokesmen of lies’ (Mansoor 1961) and ‘sowers of deceit’ (García Martínez 1996). Our understanding of מלִיצֵי תַעוּת (1QH^a 10.14) as ‘mediators of error’ and מַטִּיף כֹּזֵב (CD 8.13) as

¹⁵⁴ דֹּרְשֵׁי חֲלָקוֹת (1QH^a 10.15) should perhaps be viewed likewise; see n.153 above.

‘a spouter of a lie’, would suggest ‘mediators of a lie’ to be, for our purposes, a terminologically consistent rendering of מליצי כזב (1QH^a 10.31).¹⁵⁵

Quite apart from the question of whether specific historical groups can be deemed to lie behind these designations, should we regard מליצי תעות and מליצי כזב as indicative of two (fictional?/historical?) groups of opponents or as alternative labels for a single entity? In addition to terminological and structural similarities there are contextual parallels. As with the ‘mediators of error’ in 1QH^a 10.13-17a, so too here the ‘mediators of a lie’ are brought into association with דורשי חלקות, ‘seekers of smooth things’ (1QH^a 10.32; cf. 10.15).¹⁵⁶ The similar phrase דורשי רמיה (1QH^a 10.34) is reminiscent of the ‘men of deceit’ (אנשי רמיה) in 1QH^a 10.16, and should perhaps accordingly be rendered ‘seekers of deceit’.¹⁵⁷

Thus, in both 1QH^a 10.13-17a and 10.31b-34a the forces of opposition are denoted by three discernible labels. Just as the speaker is set against (i) מליצי תעות, (ii) דורשי חלקות and (iii) אנשי רמיה in 1QH^a 10.13-17a, so in 10.31b-34a he is opposed by (i) מליצי כזב, (ii) דורשי חלקות and (iii) דורשי רמיה. Assuming that דורשי חלקות in 1QH^a 10.32 should be considered identical with those that appear in 10.15, might we perhaps further speculate that מליצי תעות and מליצי כזב (1QH^a 10.14; 10.31), and similarly אנשי רמיה and דורשי רמיה (1QH^a 10.16; 10.34), should also be regarded as synonymous designations?¹⁵⁸ In addition, Holm-Nielsen notes a supposedly deliberate parallel

¹⁵⁵ As indeed Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996) elect to translate מליצי כזב when it reappears in 1QH^a 12.9b-11a.

¹⁵⁶ The designation would appear to draw upon Isaiah 30.10. Note also לא תחזרו לנו ולחזים לא תחזרו לנו (Isaiah 30.10); cf. חזוי נבחות (1QH^a 10.15). See n.153 above.

¹⁵⁷ So too Holm-Nielsen (1960) and Mansoor (1961). Cf. ‘(those) who search deceit’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); ‘those that look for deceit’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961); ‘those who seek deceit’ (Knibb 1994a; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); ‘seekers of falsehood’ (Vermes 2004); ‘interpreters of trickery’ (García Martínez 1996).

¹⁵⁸ Knibb 1994a, pp.171-172.

between מליצי כזב, which he renders ‘interpreters of lies’ (so too Knibb 1994a; cf. n.111 above), and דורשי חלקות (Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.48, n.3). Might the two likewise be alternative designations for the same oppositional group? Indeed, given the terminological similarity between דורשי רמיה and דורשי חלקות, it is possible that between these two passages we simply have five synonyms applicable to opponents in the text.

Such an understanding of general oppositional themes would appear congruent with the context of 1QH^a 10.13-17a and 10.31b-34a, and simpler than positing three (or even five) distinct opposing groups in these passages. If the case, doubt is cast on the ability to identify (or even confirm the existence of) specific referents behind these designations:

Although such interpretations cannot be precluded, one should use the same caution here as in the O.T. psalms, where formerly attempts used to be made to apply the stereotyped expressions for enemies to particular people. Not only are names never mentioned, but the conventionalised phraseology never makes it at all clear whom is meant. Until something else can be demonstrated, I find it most reasonable to understand the expressions as simply taken over from the O.T. terminology. (Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.48, n.3)¹⁵⁹

With regard to sobriquet development however, these occurrences may yet be of some use. We have already noted that both elements of מליצי תעות (1QH^a 10.14) are to be found in some form in the terminology used to describe one ‘who spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ in the Damascus Document (CD 1.13-15). How greater the significance then that in our present passage תעות is replaced by כזב.

Let us examine once again the passage from the Damascus Document:

^{1.13}That was the time about which it is written, “like a stray heifer, ¹⁴so Israel strayed”, when arose the Man of Scoffing {איש הלצון} who spouted to Israel ¹⁵waters of a lie {כזב} and led them astray {תעות} in a wilderness without a way (CD 1.13-15).

¹⁵⁹ Knibb, on the other hand, argues that the various terms employed “suggest that the activities of a distinct rival group of opponents are in mind, even though the precise circumstances are unclear” (1994a, p.171).

The designation מליצי כזב contains an element that shares a root with לצון, found in the sobriquet ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (איש הלצון; cf. Richardson 1955), and furthermore a qualification, כזב, that occurs in the description of the same figure as ‘a spouter of a lie’ (מטיף כזב; CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). Indeed, Mansoor (who renders מליצי כזב, ‘spokesmen of lies’) implies an explicit connection between this designation and the sobriquet ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (מטיף הכזב), drawing attention to the possible translation ‘babblers of lies’ (1961, p.110, n.5).¹⁶⁰

Certainly, in terms of descriptive value, a distinct similarity exists between ‘mediators of error’ (1QH^a 10.14), ‘mediators of a lie’ (1QH^a 10.31) and ‘a spouter of a lie’ (CD 8.13). All indicate the proponents of false teaching, offset against the correct teachings of the protagonist of the Hodayot or the figure described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ in the Damascus Document.¹⁶¹ Knibb notes that the specific employment of מליצי תעות and מליצי כזב in the Hodayot:

suggests that *the major point at issue* between the psalmist and his enemies was false teaching. (Knibb 1994a, p.172; my italics)

Such is what we also find between the ‘teacher’ and his opponents in the Damascus Document, reflected in the descriptive use of נטף and ירה with appropriate further qualification. One would again expect from this that a retrospective identification of the protagonist of the Hodayot with the ‘teacher’ would have entailed the designation מליצי כזב being read in the light of מטיף כזב. Consequently, though it may not have fed directly into the developmental process of the sobriquet, this and similar designations in the Hodayot provide us with a wider thematic background against which to understand such labelling.

¹⁶⁰ Note that Richardson regards לץ and its derivatives within scripture in reference to ‘talking freely’ and the noun ‘babbler’ (Richardson 1955; see n.145 above).

¹⁶¹ Cf. Mowinckel 1956, p.271.

1QH^a 12.6b-11a [4.6b-11a]

The term מל יצי כזב also appears in a passage from column 12 of the re-ordered 1QH^a:

^{12.6}But they, your people [... ⁷...] ... they smooth them {החליקו} and מל יצי רמיה [le]ad them astray {התעומו}, and they are brought to ruin without insight, for [...] ⁸their deeds in folly. For (I) have been rejected by them and they do not esteem me when you make yourself great through me. For they banish me from my land ⁹like a bird from its nest, and all my friends and my acquaintances have been driven from me and esteem me as a broken vessel. But they are מל יצי כזב ¹⁰ and חוזי רמיה, they have schemes of Belial against me, to change your law which you engraved in my heart for חלקות ¹¹for your people. (1QH^a 12.6b-11a) [= Sukenik 4.6b-11a]

Appearing in exactly the same form as at 1QH^a 10.31, the ‘mediators of a lie’ again denote an opposing party to the speaker.¹⁶² A third example of the construction מל יצי followed by pejorative noun also appears in the text, מל יצי רמיה (cf. Douglas 1999, p.249). In addition to the designations ‘mediators of error’ (מל יצי תעוה; 1QH^a 10.14) and ‘mediators of a lie’ (מל יצי כזב; 1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10), this recalls the ‘men of deceit’ (אנשי רמיה; 1QH^a 10.16) and ‘seekers of deceit’ (דורשי רמיה; 1QH^a 10.34) of earlier passages, thus suggesting ‘mediators of deceit’ as a suitable rendering.¹⁶³

¹⁶² Given that מל יצי כזב appears in identical form at 1QH^a 10.31 and 12.9-10, there is a surprising degree of inconsistency within most translations. For example, ‘mediators of deceit’ and ‘mediators of fraud’ respectively (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); ‘mediators of lies’ and ‘mediators of a lie’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); ‘interpreters of lies’ and ‘spokesmen of lies’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960); ‘lying interpreters’ and ‘teachers of lies’ (Vermes 2004); ‘spokesmen of lies’ and ‘preachers of lie’ (Mansoor 1961). Perhaps this suitably demonstrates the generalised, stereotypical quality of these and similar labels. Nevertheless, while acknowledging the arguably non-specific nature of such designations, we shall attempt to maintain some consistency in translation in order to better reflect the underlying Hebrew text, lest otherwise important repetitions or parallels go unnoticed.

¹⁶³ So too García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997 and Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Cf. ‘interpreters of deceit’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Mansoor 1961); ‘spokesmen of deceit’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960); ‘sowers of fraud’ (García Martínez 1996). Vermes’ translation is problematic at this point as his use of brackets does not accurately reflect what is in the text and what constitutes reconstruction: ‘Teachers of lies [have smoothed] Thy people [with words], and [false prophets] have led them astray’ (Vermes 2004). Perhaps one may suggest: ‘[Teachers of lies] have smoothed Thy people [with words], and false prophets have [le]d them astray’. Thus Vermes would appear to render מל יצי רמיה, ‘false prophets’.

The passage would appear to confirm our earlier speculation that these designations for opposing forces in the Hodayot are interchangeable and therefore synonymous. The accusation that ‘mediators of deceit [le]ad them astray’ (מליצי; 1QH^a 12.7) hints at the label ‘mediators of error’ (מליצי תעות; 1QH^a 10.14) and further recalls the use of תעה in CD 1.15. Indeed so far, by noting the use of the shared roots תעה, לייץ and כזב, we have in some form associated מליצי כזב (1QH^a 10.14), מליצי תעות (1QH^a 10.11), לציים (1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10), and now מליצי רמיה (1QH^a 12.7) with the ‘traitors’ of CD 1.11-15.¹⁶⁴ Combined with the presence of *contextual* similarities within the Hodayot where these different designations occur, a strong case can accordingly be made for regarding them as synonymous labels, drawing upon a wealth of interchangeable stereotypical imagery.¹⁶⁵

A further example of pejorative labelling within our present passage is the reference to ‘seers of deceit’ (חוזי רמיה; 1QH^a 12.10).¹⁶⁶ As well as terminological similarities with מליצי רמיה, אנשי רמיה and דורשי רמיה, an obvious parallel can be drawn with the ‘seers of truth’ (חוזי נבוחות) of 1QH^a 10.15 (cf. חוזי אמת; CD 2.12-13). James Bowley suggests that CD 2.12-13 should be taken in reference to the prophets, and further notes that חוזה is equated with נביא in 2 Samuel 24.11 (1999, p.359).¹⁶⁷ Given the sense of false teaching implied by designations such as ‘mediators of a lie’ and ‘mediators of

¹⁶⁴ Note also דורשי חלקות (1QH^a 10.15; 10.32; cf. 12.7; 12.10) and perhaps רמיה (1QH^a 10.34); cf. CD 1.18. Furthermore, עדת דורשי חלקות (1QH^a 10.32) and עדת בוגדים (CD 1.12).

¹⁶⁵ Other designations we have encountered, such as אנשי רמיה (1QH^a 10.16), would appear on the grounds of context and terminological similarities (e.g. with מליצי רמיה and דורשי רמיה) to likewise be understood within this framework.

¹⁶⁶ So too Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Cf. ‘seers of falsehood’ (Vermes 2004); ‘seers of fraud’ (García Martínez 1996).

¹⁶⁷ ‘When David rose in the morning, the word of the LORD came to the prophet Gad, David’s seer’ (2 Samuel 24.11).

error', does this reference to 'seers of deceit' imply more specifically therefore a theme of false prophecy? We have already noted such an understanding to lie at least partially behind the description 'a spouter of a lie' in the Damascus Document (cf. CD 5.20 – 6.2; Ezekiel 13; Micah 2.11; 3.5). Bowley notes a significant difference however between the use of חוזה and נביא in the sectarian material:

It is interesting to note that the term [חוזה] is never used in an absolute form, but always in construct with another noun, which may be negative (חוזה רמיה, "seers of deceit," 1QH^a 12:10; cf. 12:20) or positive (חוזה אמת, "seers of truth," CD 2:12; cf. 1QH^a 12:18). It also never occurs in construct with a definite noun, in contrast to נביא, which is usually found with the article. If these few uses of חוזה are representative, one may conclude that the title חוזה, besides being less frequent, was used *without definite reference* to the prophets of Israel's past. In the case of the more common sobriquet, חוזה נביא was simply employed to refer to a known group, which was apparently *not the case* with חוזה. (Bowley 1999, pp.359-360; my italics)

Such would agree with our own interpretation of these designations, that they do not refer to specific opposing groups but represent a textual typology of opposition. We cannot therefore assert with the same confidence as Knibb that "the activities of a distinct rival group of opponents are in mind" (1994a, p.171; see n.159 above), though if the case it was certainly one to whom a plurality of interchangeable labels could be applied. Instead, an equally valid case can be made that these designations denote a general theme of opposition such as is found in both scriptural texts and the Hodayot in the ideological dualism between 'the righteous' (צדיק) and 'the wicked' (רשע). Therefore, no "distinct rival group" was necessarily in the mind of the author, though of course the text could retrospectively have been applied to such. Accordingly, *all* who might conceivably oppose the speaker (whether in the past or future) would be brought within the applicability of these labels.

The 'mediators of a lie and seers of deceit' (1QH^a 12.9-10) are mentioned in connection with 'schemes of Belial' (1QH^a 12.10), just as the 'men of deceit' are in 1QH^a 10.16-17, again suggesting that in all likelihood חוזה רמיה and

אנשי רמיה at least should be regarded as synonymous.¹⁶⁸ These schemes are further detailed, ‘to change your law which you engraved in my heart for smooth things {חלקות} for your people’ (1QH^a 12.10-11), recalling the דורשי חלקות that appear in association with both ‘interpreters of error’ and ‘men of deceit’ in 1QH^a 10.13-17a and the ‘mediators of a lie’ and ‘seekers of deceit’ in 10.31b-34a (cf. also החליקו at 1QH^a 12.7, in association with ‘mediators of deceit’). That this law is engraved on the speaker’s heart is reminiscent in the first instance of 1QH^a 10.17b-18:

^{10.17}They throw into the pit the life of the man in whose mouth you have established and imparted understanding. ¹⁸You placed it in his heart {שמחה בלבבו} to open a fountain of knowledge for all those who understand. (1QH^a 10.17b-18) [= Sukenik 2.17b-18]

However, more striking is the parallel with Jeremiah 31.33, part of a passage already noted in our examination of the Damascus Document for the presence of a ‘new covenant’ (ברית חדשה) in the context of a planting metaphor (Jeremiah 31.27-34; see n.90 above):

But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. (Jeremiah 31.33)

If we were to posit that the law engraved on the speaker’s heart in 1QH^a 12.10-11 purposefully alludes to Jeremiah 31.33, then a significant association would be established between the protagonist and the concept of a ‘new covenant’ (an association that would have considerable implications for an attempt to identify

¹⁶⁸ Devorah Dimant notes that בליעל is “used in biblical parlance as an adjective meaning ‘base’, ‘wicked’ (e.g., Deut 13:14; Prov 6:12)” (1984, p.534). Holm-Nielsen and Mansoor advocate such an understanding within the Hodayot and translate accordingly (cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.36, n.38; Mansoor 1961, p.107, n.3). Though we have attempted to retain a literal rendering, this insight should be borne in mind.

this figure with the ‘teacher’ of the Damascus Document, arguably the instigator of the ‘new covenant’ there; cf. Davies 1983, pp.173-197).¹⁶⁹

The overall picture from 1QH^a 12.6b-11a confirms that of 10.13-17a and 10.31b-34a. Yet more designations are employed that display a thematic, if not strictly terminological, affinity with the description of ‘a spouter of a lie’ (מטִיף) in the Damascus Document. חזוֹי רמִיה in particular has been demonstrated to imply an accusation of false prophecy (cf. 2 Samuel 24.11). These thematic links with ‘a spouter of a lie’ find expression in, for example, the rendering of מלִיצֵי כֹזֵב in 1QH^a 12.9-10 by Mansoor and Vermes as ‘preachers of lie’ and ‘teachers of lies’ respectively (Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004), both terms that could adequately apply to מטִיף כֹזֵב when contrasted with מורה צדק. Nevertheless, in the Hodayot these designations would appear to remain indicative of a general theme of opposition rather than having been conceived in reference to specific groups.

1QH^a 12.14b-20 [4.14b-20]

The final passage we shall consider from the Hodayot with regard to the sobriquet מטִיף הכֹזֵב is from a little further down the same column:

^{10.14}A root which produces poison and bitterness is in their thoughts, ¹⁵and with stubbornness of heart they inquire and seek you among idols, and place in front of themselves the stumbling-block of their iniquities, and they come ¹⁶to seek you in the mouth of נבִיאֵי כֹזֵב, deceived by error {תעוּת}. And they, [in] stam[mer]ing lip and another tongue, speak to your people, ¹⁷to make folly all their deeds in deceit {רמִיה}. For they have not chosen in the way {בדרך} of your [heart] and have not listened to your word. For they said ¹⁸of the vision of knowledge {חזון דעת}, “It is not sure”, and of the way of your heart, “It is not that”. But you, God, will reply to them, judging them ¹⁹in your might [according to] their idols and the multitude of their sins, in order that they are caught in their plans those who separate from your covenant. ²⁰And you will cut off in ju[dgem]ent all מרמה אנשי חזוֹי תעוּת, and חזוֹי תעוּת will no longer be found. (1QH^a 12.14b-20) [= Sukenik 4.14b-20]

¹⁶⁹ Note however, על־לבם אכתבנה (Jeremiah 31.33); cf. שונתה בלבבי (1QH^a 12.10); nevertheless, an emphasis exists in both passages on the implication of such an act upon the people of God: לעמכה (1QH^a 12.11); ודמה יהירלי לעם (Jeremiah 31.33).

This passage is paralleled in 4Q430 (frag.1, 2-7), though, due to the poor state of preservation, only כֹּזֵב remains of the designation נְבִיאֵי כֹזֵב (1QH^a 12.16).¹⁷⁰

This significant phrase has been variously rendered ‘prophets of fraud’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), ‘prophets of deceit’ (García Martínez 1996), ‘prophets of falsehood’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961), ‘lying prophets’ (Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) and ‘prophets of lies’ (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961). This last comes the closest to what would constitute for our present thesis a consistent translation, ‘prophets of a lie’.

The term recalls the theme of false prophecy already mentioned as inherent in the designation חֲזוֹי רְמִיָּה (1QH^a 12.10; cf. Bowley 1999, p.359). More significantly, it echoes the phrase יִנְבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר, indicating those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ in the FSL (CD 6.1). In CD 5.20 – 6.2, those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ are set in opposition to the ‘holy anointed ones’ (מְשִׁיחִים; 6.1), ranked as true prophets (Bowley 1999, pp.358-359). We speculated in Chapter Two that, just as the anticipated ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (6.11) would appear to have been cast in the role of an eschatological successor to these past conveyors of God’s teaching, so an oppositional role to this figure would likely be cast in the mould of those who יִנְבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר. In our examination of the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, we found that the figure described as ‘a spouter of a lie’, set in clear opposition to ‘a teacher of righteousness’, was indeed depicted in terms that combined accusations of false teaching and false prophecy (CD 1.10-18a; 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.10-15; cf. Isaiah 9.14-16; 28; Ezekiel 13; Micah 2.11; 3.5). The designation ‘prophets of a lie’ (נְבִיאֵי כֹזֵב; 1QH^a 12.16) is terminologically closer to the specific description of this singular figure as ‘a spouter of a lie’ (מְטִיף כֹּזֵב) than is the reference to those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (יִנְבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר; CD 6.1). Might it be arguable that we have therefore in

¹⁷⁰ חֲזוֹי רְמִיָּה and אֲנָשִׁי מְרֵמָה (1QH^a 12.20) are entirely absent from 4Q430 as the fragment breaks off at לְהַעֲנֶה (1QH^a 12.18).

1QH^a 12.16 an intermediary step between ינבאו שקר and מטִיף כֹּזֵב (or perhaps אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב)?¹⁷¹

Such a bold movement would go beyond the available evidence, and indeed we have already identified some justification for the predominant use of כֹּזֵב in the ESL of the Damascus Document (e.g. מטִיף כֹּזֵב; CD 8.13) over the more readily suggestible שקר (e.g. ינבאו שקר; CD 6.1 [FSL]), based upon an adoption of נטִיף (in opposition to יֵרֵה) and subsequent association with כֹּזֵב on the grounds of Micah 2.11.¹⁷² It is perhaps enough to note that the Hodayot, belonging to the ESL, preserves a designation (נבִיאִי כֹזֵב; 1QH^a 12.16) that echoes the sentiment of a similar phrase in the FSL (ינבאו שקר; CD 6.1), yet whose main point of difference is the employment of a noun (כֹּזֵב) that finds particular expression elsewhere among the sectarian literature in labels denoting an oppositional figure who embodies such false prophecy.

Bowley notes that the protagonist of the Hodayot is never, by contrast, expressly referred to as a ‘true prophet’ (though note נבוֹחֹת חוֹזִי; 1QH^a 10.15; cf. חוֹזֵן דַּעַת; 1QH^a 12.18).¹⁷³ Instead, false prophecy is contrasted with ‘your law’ (תּוֹרַתְכֶם; 12.10) and ‘your word’ (דְּבַרְכֶם; 12.17), thus presenting the difference between the speaker and the ‘prophets of a lie’:

not as a conflict between two equal but contradictory truth-claims (prophet versus prophet) – but rather as a conflict between self-proclaimed prophets and the already accepted God-given Torah. (Bowley 1999, p.372)

He further points to 4Q339, a list of ‘false prophets who arose in Israel’ (4Q339 1), as evidence that “describing one’s adversaries as false prophets was not merely a poetic flourish by the author of the *Hodayot*” (1999, p.372). Such is indeed what we have also found to be the case in the Damascus Document, where

¹⁷¹ William Brownlee suggests that ‘the Man of the Lie’ deliberately “parodies the Old Testament title ‘man of God’ for a prophet” (1982, p.10; cf. Eshel 1999a, p.335).

¹⁷² See n.59 above.

¹⁷³ Bowley 1999, p.372.

the teachings of מורה צדק are likewise contrasted with those of false teachers and prophets.

It is stated that ‘they come to seek you in the mouth of {מפי} prophets of a lie, deceived by error {תעות}’ (1QH^a 12.15-16), reminiscent of the claim by the speaker that ‘you have placed in my mouth {בפי} as it were an early rain {כיורה}’ (1QH^a 16.16). Thus the ‘teaching’ of the protagonist (assuming such an understanding of יורה) is expressly contrasted with that issuing from the mouth of false prophets. The recurrence of תעה in this context brings to mind the ‘traitors’ of CD 1.11-17 who were similarly ‘led astray’ (יתעם) by one who ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’.¹⁷⁴ It further recalls the ‘mediators of error’ (מליצי תעות; 1QH^a 10.14) and the accusation that ‘mediators of deceit [le]ad them (your people) astray’ (מליצי רמיה [ה]תעום; 12.7). In our present text, false prophecy and תעה are brought into even closer association within the designation חוזי תעות, accordingly rendered ‘seers of error’.¹⁷⁵ Combining elements already encountered in the labels מליצי תעות (1QH^a 10.14) and חוזי רמיה (1QH^a 12.10), it would appear to once again demonstrate the interchangeable nature of the constituent elements of such designations in the Hodayot, and hence perhaps the synonymous quality of these labels applicable to opponents in the text.

A further designation to appear in 1QH^a 12.14b-20 is אנשי מרמה (1QH^a 12.20). The affinity with אנשי רמיה (1QH^a 10.16) is demonstrated by the fact that both are translated ‘men of deceit’ without distinction by Dupont-Sommer (1961), Holm-Nielsen (1960) and Mansoor (1961). Though the phrases may well

¹⁷⁴ Note also that those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (ינבאו שקר; CD 6.1) in the FSL are likewise accused of having ‘led Israel astray’ (יתעו את ישראל; CD 5.20).

¹⁷⁵ So too Dupont-Sommer 1961; Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Cf. ‘seers of delusion’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

be synonymous in meaning and are both derived from the root **רמה**, we shall nevertheless preserve the distinction with regard to form and thus render ‘men of deception’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).¹⁷⁶ The designation may, like much in the Hodayot, draw upon the book of Psalms where the singular **אִישׁ־מְרֹמֶה** appears (Psalms 43.1). A related singular form, ‘a man of blood and deception’ (**אִישׁ־דָּמִים וּמְרֹמֶה**), occurs in Psalms 5.7, along with ‘speakers of a lie’ (**דְּבָרֵי כֹזֶב**), while Psalms 55.21-24 has the plural ‘men of blood and deception’ (**אֲנָשֵׁי דָמִים וּמְרֹמֶה**; 55.24) in the context of covenant violation (**חָלַל בְּרִיתוֹ**; 55.21), smoothness (**חֲלָק**; 55.22) and ‘the righteous (one)’ (**צַדִּיק**; 55.23). Each of these contextual references has some parallel in the Hodayot, suggesting once again that we are dealing with a pool of stereotypical imagery.

1QH^a 12.19 mentions ‘those who separate from your covenant’, once again highlighting the context of covenant defection and departure from ‘the way’ (cf. 1QH^a 12.17-18). As we have seen, this theme is present also in the Damascus Document where such departure is likewise at the instigation or encouragement of false teachers (CD 1.11-17; 3.10-12; 19.33 – 20.1; 20.10-15). Even the reference to a ‘root which produces poison and bitterness’ (**שׁוֹרֵשׁ פֹּרֶה רֹשׁ**) (1QH^a 12.14), while drawing upon Deuteronomy 29.17, recalls by way of contrast the ‘root of planting’ (**שׁוֹרֵשׁ מַטְעָה**) of the Damascus Document (CD 1.7). We have already noted the use of planting imagery in 1QH^a 16.4-26 and similar is to be found in 1QH^a 14.14-19.¹⁷⁷ Interestingly, this latter passage is followed by a further designation of note:

¹⁷⁶ Cf. ‘deceitful men’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); ‘men of lies’ (Vermes 2004). See **מְרֹמֶה** in Clines (ed.) 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995. Cf. n.152 above.

¹⁷⁷ See further Dimant 1984, p.539; Fujita 1976; Hempel 1999a, p.329, n.36; Stuckenbruck 2005; Tiller 1997. Cf. n.19 above.

But those committed to my testimony have been deceived by מל'יצי שקר [...] in the service of righteousness {צדק}. (1QH^a 14.19) [= Sukenik 6.19]¹⁷⁸

The immediately following text is paralleled in 4Q429 (frag.2, 1.8), though, due to the poor state of preservation, none of the above text has survived; thus it is unclear what exactly appeared in the lacuna. Sukenik refrained from an attempt at reconstruction in his transcription (1955), as did Lohse (1981). Several scholars however have suggested reading the first word as מל'יצי (Davies 1987, p.99; Douglas 1999, p.249; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Kuhn (ed.) 1960; Vermes 2004), coupled with either שקר (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997) or כזב (Douglas 1999, p.249).¹⁷⁹ Hence proffered reconstructions include 'those spreading lies' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 'teachers of lies' (Vermes 2004), 'lying mediators' (Douglas 1999) and 'interpreters of falsehood' (Dupont-Sommer 1961).

The designation מל'יצי שקר does not appear elsewhere in the Hodayot, though note לשון שקר (1QH^a 13.27) and שפתי שקר (1QH^a 15.11-12), which would suggest מל'יצי כזב to be a more likely reconstruction (cf. 1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10).¹⁸⁰ Though שקר and כזב are largely synonymous, the distinction is an important one. If García Martínez and Tigchelaar are right to reconstruct מל'יצי שקר, we have in this passage a juxtaposition of שקר and צדק such as is found by implication in CD 5.20 – 6.11 between ינבאו שקר and יורה הצדק. Accordingly, מל'יצי שקר (1QH^a 12.16), ינבאו שקר (CD 6.1), כזב (1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10) and מל'יצי כזב (1QH^a 14.19) could be viewed as mutually enlightening and inform our understanding of the process of sobriquet

¹⁷⁸ The reconstruction of the text here follows García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997.

¹⁷⁹ Mansoor renders 'have been enticed by de[ceit ...]' (Mansoor 1961), indicative that he would reconstruct [...] מנרמה (cf. his translation 'men of deceit' for אנשי מרמה; 1QH^a 12.20).

¹⁸⁰ See Mowinckel 1956, p.271.

development.¹⁸¹ However, in the absence of the designation מליצי שקר elsewhere in the Hodayot (and given the rarity of the construction מליצי followed by pejorative noun, which would militate against positing an additional label of this form; cf. Douglas 1999, p.249), מליצי כזב would prove a more modest reconstruction at 1QH^a 14.19.

Summary

The sobriquet מטיר הכזב does not appear in the H-material in either definite or indefinite form. Neither are the labels ‘the Man of Scoffing’ or ‘the Man of the Lie’ employed. However, numerous related designations for opposing parties do appear, often utilising similar terminology: scoffers (לצים; 1QH^a 10.11); ‘mediators of error’ (מליצי תעות; 10.14); ‘seers of error’ (חוזי תעות; 12.20); ‘mediators of deceit’ (מליצי רמיה; 12.7); ‘seers of deceit’ (חוזי רמיה; 12.10); ‘seekers of deceit’ (דורשי רמיה; 10.34); ‘men of deceit’ (אנשי רמיה; 6.14; 10.16); ‘men of deception’ (אנשי מרמה; 12.20); ‘mediators of a lie’ (מליצי כזב; 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]); ‘prophets of a lie’ (נביאי כזב; 12.16).¹⁸² It is notable that these share remarkable terminological *and contextual* affinities, suggesting that we might perhaps regard these labels denoting opposition as interchangeable and synonymous. They also consistently appear in plural and indefinite form, at odds with the terminologically similar designations איש הלצון (CD 1.14) and איש הכזב (CD 20.15) considered in our examination of the Damascus Document.¹⁸³

The terminological points of contact with designations in the Damascus Document are primarily scriptural in origin, drawing for example upon Isaiah 30,

¹⁸¹ מליצי שקר would thus be rendered most consistently, ‘mediators of falsehood’.

¹⁸² Also ‘seekers of smooth things’ (דורשי חלקות; 1QH^a 10.15; 10.32; cf. 12.7; 12.10) and, according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997), ‘mediators of falsehood’ (מליצי שקר; 1QH^a 14.19). See further, Holm-Nielsen 1960, pp.292-293; Mansoor 1961, p.51.

¹⁸³ The plural form אנשי הלצון does appear (CD 20.11) but with the article.

Ezekiel 13 and the books of Psalms and Proverbs. Accordingly, Callaway concludes of the protagonist of the Hodayot:

He always uses biblical imagery to present them as a dominion of evil. Since specific examples of this general description of evil adversaries are never given, one should probably avoid historicizing this language. ... Its conventionalized phraseology about enemies and the absence of names prevent one from saying anything about the actual identities of the protagonist and the antagonists nor concerning the historical nature of the conflict between them. (Callaway 1988, p.192)¹⁸⁴

Nevertheless, while *historical* identification may be problematic to say the least, the shared use of imagery between the Hodayot and the Damascus Document suggest some association with regard to the terminology utilised and hence perhaps the development and employment of the labels found therein. There are some significant thematic overlaps, chiefly concerning the roots לִיץ, תעה and כזב.¹⁸⁵

The construction מלִיצי followed by pejorative noun (of which we have at least three examples: מליצי תעות, מליצי רמיה and מליצי כזב) is especially interesting as it is, according to Michael Douglas, unique among Jewish literature (1999, p.249). The three examples given are largely identical in meaning, combining the action of mediation (derived from the root לִיץ) with one of three synonyms for falsehood ('error' / 'deceit' / 'lie').¹⁸⁶ The purpose of such a construction is seemingly to offset the positive designation, מליץ דעת (1QH^a 10.13), adopted by the speaker, and thus form a stark contrast between the two

¹⁸⁴ Similarly, Holm-Nielsen states that "every effort to find a historical background for the stereotyped phraseology is over-interpretation" (1960, p.47). Conversely, adopting perhaps an overly-simplistic view of the relationship between the Hodayot and the pesharim, Bilhah Nitzan asserts of the conflict depicted in the former between the protagonist and his opponents: "The resemblance of these details to the words of the *Pesher Scrolls* is proof of their being grounded in reality" (1994, p.326). Cf. n.109 above.

¹⁸⁵ Though also of note are חלק and דרש.

¹⁸⁶ Though demonstrably unlikely to be the case, if García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) are correct to reconstruct מלִיצי שקר at 1QH^a 14.19, this designation, 'mediators of falsehood', would likewise fit this pattern.

parties.¹⁸⁷ The association of לייץ and כזב in the label מליצי כזב is particularly striking given the prominence of the same association in the Damascus Document where an oppositional figure is given the alternative designations איש הלצון (CD 1.14) and איש הכזב (CD 20.15), and is also described as מטף כזב (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). Of especial significance in this context is CD 1.13-15 which combines לייץ, כזב and תעה.

Aside from terminological similarities between their *constituent* elements, as construct units מליצי העות (1QH^a 10.14), מליצי רמיה (12.7) and מליצי (10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]), along with the other Hodayot designations (such as איש הלצון [12.20] or אנשי רמיה [6.14; 10.16]), share with איש הלצון (CD 1.14), איש הכזב (CD 20.15) and מטף כזב (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26) a common theme denoting false teaching. In the Hodayot, the teachings of others are contrasted with that of the speaker (מליץ דעת; 1QH^a 10.13; cf. 16.16-17), and labelled ‘error’, ‘deceit’ and ‘a lie’. The polemic engaged in by this process however is so broad as to render in effect *all* teaching that does not conform with that of the speaker in this category. The Damascus Document, while utilising the same terminology to highlight false teaching, does so in reference to an individual figure and his followers; thus the labels function in such a way as to seemingly target a distinct group.

These similarities *and* differences between designations in the Hodayot and in the Damascus Document make significant for our purposes the following observation by Philip Davies:

Is there any significance in the similarity between the 1QH mlsy kzb and the connection between lswn and kzb in CD? Are we, in other words, observing the formation of soubriquets for individual opponents out of more general terms characterizing opposition in 1QH but not applied to any specific group? (Davies 1987, p.99-100)¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁷ Note also the plural form, מליצי דעת (1QH^a 23[bottom].6). Cf. ואין מליץ בנים (1QH^a 14.13); למליץ באלה (1QH^a 23[top].11).

¹⁸⁸ Similarly Bengtsson notes (though presumably in reference to the pesharim): “Even though not appearing in the Hodayoth, the designations איש הכזב and מטף הכזב could also have been

This insight, already anticipated in our present examination of the Hodayot (see n.150 above), may provide us with a way forward for understanding the relationship between these two texts with regard to the employment of labels denoting opposition and the process of sobriquet development.

3.2.2.3. Sobriquets in the Hodayot

Though no occurrences of *מטִיף הכֹּזֵב* or *מורה הצדק* are to be found in the Hodayot, we are presented with a wealth of other designations which have terminological or contextual affinities with our sobriquets. The protagonist, often identified with the ‘teacher’ of the Damascus Document (see n.109 above), is described as ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (*מליץ דעת*; 1QH^a 10.13) for the ‘elect of righteousness’ (*בחירי צדק*; 1QH^a 10.13) and ‘seers of truth’ (*חזוי נבוחות*; 1QH^a 10.15). He is further associated with the ‘holy ones’ (*קדושים*; 1QH^a 12.25), the term *יחד* (1QH^a 12.24), ‘a spring of living water’ (*מבוע מים חיים*; 1QH^a 16.16), and it is stated that those who listen to him ‘walk in the way of your heart’ (1QH^a 12.24). The imagery is near-identical to that employed with regard to the *מורה הצדק* of the Damascus Document.

Perhaps most significantly, in 1QH^a 16.16-17 the speaker claims to have been given teaching by God, playing on the dual understanding of *ירה* as part of an extended metaphor utilising water imagery (*ואתה אלי שמתה בפי כיורה*; 1QH^a 16.16). Such corresponds to the interpretation of the term in CD 6.11a, suggesting that the speaker might be drawing upon this text from the FSL and, by implication, claiming (with divine authority) the role of the anticipated *יורה הצדק* (see n.125 above).

The teaching of this ‘mediator of knowledge’ is however contrasted with that of ‘mediators of a lie’ (*מליצי כֹּזֵב*; 1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]), ‘seers

moulded in accordance with the abundance of disparaging epithets in columns ten and twelve in 1QH^a” (2000a, p.289).

of error' (חוזי תעות; 1QH^a 12.20) and scoffers (לצים; 1QH^a 10.11), to name but a few examples. Though plural and indefinite, these designations echo the terminology, context and sense of the sobriquets 'the Man of Scoffing' (ש"א הלצון; CD 1.14) and 'the Man of the Lie' (ש"א הכזב; CD 20.15), and the description מטיף כזב (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26), from the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document. Likewise, 'prophets of a lie' (נביאי כזב; 1QH^a 12.16) is reminiscent of the similar phrase denoting those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר; CD 6.1) in the FSL, a type which we speculated may have provided the mould for מטיף הכזב.

The significance of the Hodayot designations, both positive and negative, for our examination of the process of sobriquet development is primarily *thematic*. There are no instances of מטיף הכזב or מורה הצדק in either definite or indefinite form in the Hodayot, yet the thematic overlap with the employment of such imagery in the Damascus Document nevertheless suggests the existence of some relationship between the labelling process in each. In both texts the issue of false teaching and being 'led astray' is the foremost characteristic employed in the description of opponents. In the Hodayot, the designations 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעה) and 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב) represent two contrasted types of teaching (cf. Knibb 1994a, p.172; Nickelsburg 1992, pp.653-654). The sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, and the indefinite forms found in the ESL of the Damascus Document, express an identical concern.¹⁸⁹ While none of the designations in the Hodayot explicitly relate to the development of מורה הצדק or מטיף הכזב (though cf. 1QH^a 16.16), there is some indication that specific labels applicable to individuals

¹⁸⁹ This theme also finds expression within the Hodayot in the conflict between 'the righteous (one)' (צדיק) and 'the wicked (one)' (רשע); e.g. 1QH^a 6.14-16; 7.17b-20; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13. Cf. 1QH^a 4.20-21; 5.25-27; 6.9-10; 10.12-13 (see Bengtsson 2000a, pp.65-67; Holm-Nielsen 1960, pp.290-293; Kim 1985, pp.153-191). We speculated above that this may even have had some influence upon the apparent conflict between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) and 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע) in the later pesharim (see n.101 above).

elsewhere in the sectarian literature may have been influenced by more general designations applied to opponents here. At the very least, the common use of “generic biblical images and stereotypical phrases and expressions” in the Hodayot (Harkins 2005, p.242) may have informed the portrayal of the ‘teacher’ and the specific accusations levelled against his opponents in the Damascus Document.

3.2.3. 4QCommentary on Genesis A¹⁹⁰

3.2.3.1. ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’

4Q252 5.1-7

Though 4QCommGen A (4Q252) contains no discernible designations related to **מְטִירֵי הַכּוֹזֵב**, before finishing our examination of sobriquets in the ESL we shall consider one passage from this text that may shed further light on **מִוֵּרָה** **הַצֶּדֶק**:

^{5.1}“A ruler {שְׁלִיטָה} shall [no]t depart from the tribe {שִׁבְטָה} of Judah”. When there is dominion to Israel ²“[there will not] be cut off one who sits on the throne for David”. For ‘the sceptre’ {הַמַּחְקֶקֶת} is the covenant of the kingship ³[and the thous]ands of Israel are ‘the standards’. Until there comes **מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק**, the branch of ⁴David. For to him and to his seed has been given the covenant of the kingship of his people for everlasting generations, which ⁵he kept [...] **הַתּוֹרָה** with the Men of the Community {אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְּחִידָה}, for ⁶[...] it is the assembly of the men of ⁷[...] he gave (4Q252 5.1-7).

The passage comments upon Genesis 49.10, drawing in addition upon Jeremiah 33.17, in reference to **מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק**.¹⁹¹ Noting the terminological and structural

¹⁹⁰ Fragment 6 of 4Q252, containing column 5, was previously titled ‘4QPatriarchal Blessings’ (4QP Bless: Allegro 1956a; cf. Callaway 1990, p.643). The text as a whole later became known as ‘4QPesher Genesis’ (4QpGen^a: see for example, Bernstein 1994a; Fröhlich 1994) and was regarded by Robert Eisenman and Michael Wise as ‘A Genesis Florilegium’ (Eisenman and Wise 1992). However, George Brooke, responsible for the *editio princeps* in DJD 22, has confirmed the more accurate description of the text as “a Commentary on Genesis” (1994b, p.178) and hence it is now officially designated ‘4QCommentary on Genesis A’ (4QCommGen A: Brooke 1996; Trafton 2002).

¹⁹¹ The cited text here differs somewhat from the MT which reads: ‘The **שִׁבְטָה** shall not depart from Judah nor **מִחֶקֶת** from between his feet {רַגְלָיו} until tribute comes to him [or: ‘until comes Shiloh’]; and the obedience of the peoples is his’ (Genesis 49.10). While **שִׁבְטָה** is the subject in Genesis 49.10, it is instead the object in 4Q252 5.1, demonstrating the dual understanding of the

similarities with מורה הצדק, most scholars have rendered the designation ‘the messiah of righteousness’ (Brooke 1996; 2004; Burrows 1958; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997) / ‘the Messiah of Righteousness’ (Allegro 1956a; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Eisenman and Wise 1992; Vermes 2004) or ‘the righteous messiah’ (Bernstein 1994a; Trafton 2002) / ‘the Righteous Messiah’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).¹⁹² However, John Reeves states that צדק should be taken in the sectarian material to mean “legitimate, proper, true” and remarks that:

To translate the former [משיח הצדק] as “Righteous Messiah or “Messiah of Righteousness” borders on the absurd. (Reeves 1988, p.293)

Instead he advocates the rendering ‘true anointed one’ (1988, p.293) as more indicative of the sense of the phrase.¹⁹³

However, in the opinion of this thesis, Reeves’ claim is overstated. Other scholars have likewise allowed the sense-meaning ‘true Messiah’ (Burrows 1958, p.312) or ‘Legitimate Messiah’ (Allegro 1956a, p.175), indicative perhaps of a “polemical edge” to the designation (so Reeves 1988, p.293, n.40), while maintaining a suitably literal translation.¹⁹⁴ Our analysis of, for example, מורה

term as both ‘staff’ (cf. CD 7.18 – 8.1) and ‘tribe’ (see Koehler and Baumgartner 1999). שׁל ים is consequently introduced to the text, rendered either ‘sceptre’ (Bernstein 1994a; Brooke 1996; 2004; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004) or ‘ruler’ (Allegro 1956a; Burrows 1958; Collins 1995a, p.62; Elwolde 2000, pp.8-11; Trafton 2002; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). It is the latter meaning that we shall primarily adopt seeing as the specific interpretation of the passage in 4Q252 concerns the continuation of the Davidic kingship (cf. Fitzmyer 2000, p.87). Other scholars have accordingly rendered שׁל ים, ‘sovereign’ (García Martínez 1996), ‘monarch’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961) and ‘Government’ (Eisenman and Wise 1992). Furthermore, 4Q252 follows the SP in reading רגליו (‘his banners’) rather than רגליו (MT: ‘his feet’; cf. Trafton 2002, p.216, n.118; Vermes 2004, p.494, n.1), though some scholars have indeed read הרגלים (4Q252 5.3) as הרגלים (e.g. Allegro 1956a; Bernstein 1994a; Burrows 1958; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Eisenman and Wise 1992; García Martínez 1996; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

¹⁹² Note also, ‘the messiah of justice’ (García Martínez 1996).

¹⁹³ Cross similarly suggests the reading ‘legitimate Messiah’ (1995, p.91, n.1).

¹⁹⁴ E.g. García Martínez, while adopting the translation ‘the messiah of justice’, notes that “its meaning is none other than the true, lawful Messiah” (García Martínez 1995b, p.162; my italics). It should be acknowledged that Reeves utilises such an understanding of משיח הצדק in 4Q252

צדק (CD 1.11; 20.32), יורה הצדק (CD 6.11a) and the use of צדיק (CD 1.19-20; 4.7; 1QH^a 6.14-16; 7.17b-20; 8.18; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13) suggests that, while a plurality of nuanced meanings with regard to the root צדק must be borne in mind (including ‘true’, ‘legitimate’ and ‘just’; cf. Kim 1985, pp.153-191), in these occurrences ‘righteousness’ remains a valid rendering incorporating these connotations where appropriate. Hence, ‘the Messiah of Righteousness’ constitutes an understanding of משיח הצדק that, far from “absurd”, is thoroughly consistent with our examination of other designations in the sectarian material while retaining the sense of ‘truth’ and ‘legitimacy’ inherent in the terminology.

Given that 4Q252 5.2 draws upon Jeremiah 33.17, the phrase ‘the Messiah of Righteousness, the branch of David’ (משיח הצדק צמח דוד; 4Q252 5.3-4) would appear dependent upon the wider context of Jeremiah 33.15-17:

^{33.15}In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous branch {צמח צדקה} to spring up for David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness {צדקה} in the land. ¹⁶In those days Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will live in safety. And this is the name by which it will be called: ‘The LORD is our righteousness’ {יהוה צדקנו}. ¹⁷For thus says the LORD: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel. (Jeremiah 33.15-17)

Also worthy of note is a similar passage in Jeremiah 23.5-6:

^{23.5}The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous branch {צמח צדיק}, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness {צדקה} in the land. ⁶In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety. And this is the name by which he will be called: ‘The LORD is our righteousness’ {יהוה צדקנו}. (Jeremiah 23.5-6)

5.3 to suggest the ‘True Lawgiver’ as a rendering of מורה הצדק (Reeves 1988). However, while the latter title may well imply such a meaning, this smacks more of interpretation than translation.

The association between ‘branch’, ‘righteousness’ and ‘David’ is thus established in a context that lends itself to messianic exegesis.¹⁹⁵ The specific construction **משיח הצדק** however is unique to 4Q252 5.3 and it is tempting to see here some connection with the sobriquet **מורה הצדק**.

On the one hand we might attempt to identify the two designations in some manner. We have already suggested on the grounds of similarity between CD 6.10-11a and 12.23 – 13.1 that the ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (CD 6.11a) may have been anticipated as ‘the messiah of Aaron and Israel’, in which case ‘the Messiah of Righteousness’ would certainly form an apt designation for this figure (Lim 1997, p.117; 2002, p.75).¹⁹⁶ Furthermore, there is arguably some structural parallel between these phrases from the pre-Yahadic Damascus Document and 4Q252 5.3-4:

עד בוא משיח הצדק צמח דויד (4Q252 5.3-4)

עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים (CD 6.10-11a)

עד עמוד משיח אהרן וישראל (CD 12.23 – 13.1)¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁵ On the messianic interpretation of ‘branch’ (צמח), see further Ulfsgard 2000 (also Collins 1995a; 2000b). Of significance perhaps, with regard to the establishment of the Davidic line in the context of **משיח**, is Psalms 132.9-12, 17: ^{132.9}Let your priests be clothed with righteousness {צדק}, and let your faithful shout for joy. ¹⁰For your servant David’s sake do not turn away the face of your anointed one {משיחך}. ¹¹The LORD swore to David a sure oath from which he will not turn back: ‘One of the sons of your body I will set on your throne. ¹²If your sons keep my covenant and my decrees that I shall teach them, their sons also, for evermore, shall sit on your throne. (... ¹³⁻¹⁶...) ¹⁷There I will cause a horn to sprout up {אצמ״ח} for David; I have prepared a lamp for my anointed one {משיח׳}. Cf. Collins 2000b, pp.204-206.

¹⁹⁶ Michael Knibb, wary of attributing messianic status to the ‘teacher’, notes that, “if this were so, we would expect to find some clear reflection of it in the Qumran scrolls; ... In fact, as we have seen, the teacher is explicitly mentioned in only a limited number of passages, and in none of these is it in any way suggested that he was regarded as the messiah” (1990, p.59). Might the designation **משיח הצדק** in 4Q252 however, if shown to bear terminological and contextual similarity to descriptions of the ‘teacher’ elsewhere, reflect such an understanding of the role?

¹⁹⁷ עד בוא נביא ומשיח׳ (following Qimron 1992a). Cf. 1QS 9.11: אהרון וישראל.

The משיח הצדק of 4Q252 is also associated with ‘the Men of the Community’ (אנשי היחד; 4Q252 5.5), those who are described elsewhere as having ‘listened to the voice of a teacher of righteousness {מורה צדק}’ (CD 20.32; cf. אנשי היחיד). Indeed, one of the scriptural passages presented above concerning the ‘righteous branch’, Jeremiah 23.5-6, we have already noted with regard to the ‘teacher’ on the basis of the general antithetical context of false prophecy in Jeremiah 23.9-40.¹⁹⁸ We speculated, in the light of an apparent association between the latter passage and CD 5.20 – 6.2 (e.g. the description of those who ינבאו שקר) that Jeremiah 23.5-6 may even have had some effect on the pre-Yahadic D-material’s reading of Hosea 10.12 or on the subsequent formulation of the messianic יורה הצדק expected at ‘the end of days’ (CD 6.11).¹⁹⁹ That the יורה הצדק of CD 6.11 would appear to represent an ‘eschatological’ successor to ‘the holy anointed ones’ (משיחי הקודש; CD 6.1) further associates the designation with the term משיח.

The pre-Yahadic Damascus Document highlights the role of ‘the sceptre’ (המחוקק; cf. Numbers 21.18), which it identifies with ‘the Seeker of the Law’ (דורש התורה; CD 6.7). In 4Q252 however, commenting upon Genesis 49.10, ‘the sceptre {המחוקק} is the covenant of the kingship’. While ostensibly distinct in the flavour of their exegesis, Callaway perceives that, as with CD 6.2-11a, so too in 4Q252:

a chronological schema is set up between an earlier and a later entity. (Callaway 1990, p.643)

Such an understanding would again indicate some similarity between the anticipated figures of יורה הצדק and משיח הצדק, each preceded by a ‘sceptre’. Other scholars have noted that ‘the Seeker of the Law’ is anticipated to

¹⁹⁸ See Chapter Two, n.38.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Campbell 1995a, pp.92, 97; Knibb 1994a, pp.46-47.

arise *alongside* ‘the branch of David’ in 4Q174 (frag.1, 1.11-13) and furthermore that ‘the branch’ is identified with ‘the Prince of the Congregation’ (נְשִׂא הַעֲדָה) in 4Q285 (frag.5, 4; cf. CD 7.18 – 8.1; 1Q28b 5.20).²⁰⁰ Given this association between ‘the Seeker of the Law’ and ‘the branch of David’, John Allegro proposed reading התורה [דורש ...] at 4Q252 5.5, a view that George Brooke has more recently affirmed as probable.²⁰¹ Brooke continues:

Thus while the Mehoqeq is explicitly identified with the covenant of the kingship, it is appropriate to associate the overall significance of the exegesis with the interpretation of Numbers 21 in CD 6:2-11. (Brooke 1994c, p.54)

This being the case, room is perhaps left for an association of מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק (4Q252 5.3) with יוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק (CD 6.11a) as indeed Callaway infers (1990, p.643).

If, on the other hand, we are not to identify these two designations we must consequently posit two anticipated individuals, both seemingly messianic in character, both associated with דורש התורה (and אֲנִשִׁי הַיִּחַד) and both labelled in similar fashion (יוֹרֵה / מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק). Nevertheless, this does seem to be the correct approach; while the expectation of ‘one who will teach righteousness’ belongs to the FSL (CD 6.10-11a) and is fulfilled in the ESL by the arrival of ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (CD 1.11; 20.32), our present text, anticipating ‘the Messiah of Righteousness’, belongs to this ESL and so *postdates* the fulfilment of CD 6.10-11a.²⁰² Hence, מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק cannot it seems refer to the ‘teacher’ we have encountered elsewhere.²⁰³ Instead, perhaps we should

²⁰⁰ See for example: Collins 1994b; 1995a; Fitzmyer 2000; García Martínez 1995b; Lichtenberger 2003.

²⁰¹ Allegro 1956a; cf. Brooke 1994c, p.54.

²⁰² Cf. אֲנִשִׁי הַיִּחַד (4Q252 5.5).

²⁰³ Note however that Eisenman and Wise conclude differently: “the allusion in 5.5 to ‘the men of the Community’ with ‘the Messiah of Righteousness’ as ‘Keepers of the Covenant’ implies that the Messiah has either already come, is eschatologically to return, or is, in fact, at that very moment connected to or among ‘the *Yahad*’ (Community)” (1992, p.85). Such an interpretation,

identify this post-teacher expectation with the *renewed* (post-teacher) messianic hopes of the Yahadic Damascus Document concerning ‘the Prince of all the Congregation’ (נשיא כל העדה; CD 7.20).²⁰⁴ This latter figure is likewise brought into association with ‘the Seeker of the Law’ (CD 7.18) and furthermore identified with ‘the staff’ (השבט) of Numbers 24.17 (CD 7.18 – 8.1), the same term used in 4Q252 5.1. Indeed we have already noted that ‘the branch of David’ is explicitly identified with ‘the Prince of the Congregation’ (נשיא העדה) in 4Q285 frag.5, 4 (note however the absence of כל).

An identification of נשיא (כל) העדה (4Q252 5.3) with משיח הצדק (CD 7.18 – 8.1; 4Q285 frag.5, 4) would accordingly make more sense of the evidence at hand and allow for the presence of אנשי היחד in the text. We may also be in a position to identify the source of the specific construction משיח הצדק. We have speculated that the death of ‘the Teacher of the Community’, deemed to be the anticipated יורה הצדק, necessitated an amendment of the Yahad’s messianic expectations and resulted in a *renewed* expectation of the ‘messiah from Aaron and from Israel’ (משיח מאהרן ומישראל; CD 20.1) who would be ‘the Prince of (all) the Congregation’ (CD 7.18 – 8.1; cf. 19.10-11).²⁰⁵ Consequently, 4QCommentary on Genesis A, anticipating the arrival of this figure, could draw not only upon scriptural references (e.g. the ‘righteous branch’ of Jeremiah 23.5 and 33.15) but also upon the terminology already in place to

regarding משיח הצדק as a figure of the present / past in the ESL, if adopted might yet allow an identification with the figure elsewhere described as מורה צדק (CD 1.11; 20.32).

²⁰⁴ See n.32 above.

²⁰⁵ It is unclear to what extent this may be congruent with the apparent expectation of ‘a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel’ in 1QS 9.11 (see n.197 above). The ‘Prince of (all) the Congregation’, or ‘branch of David’, has often been identified with ‘the messiah of Israel’ alone as a Davidic figure, while some scholars have suggested that ‘the Seeker of the Law’ be identified with ‘the messiah of Aaron’ on the strength of such passages as 4Q174 frag.1, 1.11-13 (cf. CD 7.18 – 8.1; see n.33 above); e.g. Collins 1994a; 1995a; Fitzmyer 2000, pp.73-110; García Martínez 1995b. Though the future orientation of ‘the Seeker of the Law’ is seemingly at odds with CD 6.2-11a, see Brooke 1991a, pp.225-227 (cf. n.33 above). Note further that Vermes identifies the ‘teacher’ with the forerunning prophet of 1QS 9.11 (2004, pp.86-87).

describe the messianic role (e.g. **יורה הצדק**).²⁰⁶ Might **משיח הצדק** therefore be related to our question of sobriquet development after all inasmuch as it may reflect a re-usage of the original label from the FSL in the light of the Yahad's renewed messianic expectations?

3.3. Conclusions

We observed that in the FSL, the sobriquets **מורי הצדק** and **מטיף** **הכזב** did not appear, though there was expressed an expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness {**יורה הצדק**} at the end of days' (CD 6.11a) and a general oppositional theme concerning those who 'prophesied falsehood' (**נבאו**) **שקר**; CD 6.1). Similarly, it would appear that neither **מורי הצדק** nor **מטיף** **הכזב** occur in the ESL. Instead we are confronted by a host of related designations, including most notably the indefinite descriptions 'a teacher of righteousness' (**מורה צדק**; CD 1.11; 20.32; cf. 20.28) and 'a spouter of a lie' (**מטיף כזב**; CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). These appear only in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document and serve to describe two figures there denoted by the sobriquets 'the Teacher of the Community' (**מורה / יורה היחיד**; CD 20.1; 20.14) and 'the Man of Scoffing / the Lie' (**איש הלצון / הכזב**; CD 1.14; 20.15).

The description **מורה צדק** functions as an implicit claim to the role of **יורה הצדק** prescribed in CD 6.10-11a. It would appear therefore to identify 'the Teacher of the Community' with this anticipated figure and so serves as an artful stratagem, re-using and applying the label of the FSL in such a way as to demonstrate its fulfilment in the present age. That the authority of the 'teacher' was not universally accepted is clear from the references to a schism and the labelling of these opponents as 'the Men of Scoffing' (**אנשי הלצון**; CD 20.11)

²⁰⁶ Thus "memories of the teacher may have colored the Messianic expectations of his followers" (Burrows 1958, p.336; cf. Schonfield 1956, pp.38-44).

and ‘those who departed from the way’ (CD 1.13) and ‘departed from the well of living water’ (CD 19.34). The most significant use of labelling with regard to these opponents however is reserved for an individual rival authority to whom both the titles ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (CD 1.14) and ‘the Man of the Lie’ (CD 20.15) were seemingly applied. In addition to the accusations levelled against him (for example, that he ‘led them (Israel) astray {יִהְיֶה} in a wilderness without a way’; CD 1.15), the terminology used to describe him (drawing upon scriptural passages such as Proverbs 19.22-29; Isaiah 9.14-16; 28; Ezekiel 13; Micah 2.11; 3.5) is distinctly polemical; the most notable example of which is his characterisation as ‘a spouter of a lie’ (מְטִיף כֶּזֶב; CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). This specific accusation is terminologically polarised from the description of ‘the Teacher of the Community’ as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מֹרֶה צְדָקָה; CD 1.11; 20.32) and even parodies the same ambiguity with regard to יָרָה as both ‘teaching’ and ‘raining’ (cf. Hosea 10.12; Joel 2.23), for the root נִטַּף can similarly be taken to mean ‘preaching’ (especially in a pejorative sense; cf. Micah 2.6-11) or ‘spouting’ (e.g. the metaphorical use in CD 1.14-15: ‘the Man of Scoffing who spouted to Israel *waters* of a lie’). While grounded in scriptural reference, the indefinite description מְטִיף כֶּזֶב is constructed specifically in opposition to מֹרֶה צְדָקָה (itself an application of the FSL designation יֹרֵה הַצְדָּקָה drawn from Hosea 10.12) in order to contrast two rival teaching authorities and demonstrate the legitimacy of that expounded by ‘the Teacher of the Community’.

Though neither definite nor indefinite forms of the sobriquets מֹרֶה צְדָקָה and מְטִיף כֶּזֶב appear in the Hodayot we are presented with an identical thematic backdrop to the conflict depicted therein. The speaker (often identified with the ‘teacher’; see n.109 above) is described as ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (מְלִיץ דַּעַת; 1QH^a 10.13) and associated with the ‘elect of righteousness’ (בְּחִירֵי צְדָקָה; 1QH^a 10.13) and ‘seers of truth’ (חֹזֵי נְכוֹחֹת; 1QH^a 10.15). He is opposed however by those labelled, amongst other things, ‘mediators of a lie’

(נבִיאֵי כֶזֶב; 1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]), ‘prophets of a lie’ (נבִיאֵי כֶזֶב; 1QH^a 12.16), ‘seers of error’ (חֹזֵי תְעוּהָ; 1QH^a 12.20) and scoffers (לִצְיָיִם; 1QH^a 10.11). Though no individual is highlighted among the opponents, the same terminology is therefore used as employed in descriptions of ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ in the Damascus Document (in particular, the roots לִיץ and תְעוּהָ). The designations in the Hodayot, as with those in the Damascus Document, contrast true and false teaching, seeking by the process of labelling to present all opponents of the speaker in the role of false teachers or prophets.²⁰⁷ The teaching of the speaker however is described as having been given by God (וְאֵתָהּ אֵלִי שְׁמַתָּה בְּפִי כִיּוֹרָה; 1QH^a 16.16). Interestingly this passage utilises water imagery and plays on the same dual understanding of יֵרֶה present in CD 6.11a, raising the possibility that we have here an implicit claim (in the first-person) to the role of יוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק.²⁰⁸

While no specific occurrences of definite or indefinite forms of מוֹרֶה appear in the Hodayot, the primary importance of this text for our understanding of sobriquet development is thematic. On this level, the Hodayot and the Damascus Document are in near perfect agreement, each depicting a conflict between rival teaching authorities and using similar terminology and labelling processes to identify false teachers. It may even be that more general designations in the Hodayot informed the specific accusations of the Damascus Document.²⁰⁹

Our examination of the label ‘the Messiah of Righteousness’ (מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק; 4Q252 5.3) in 4QCommentary on Genesis A suggested that, despite both terminological and contextual similarities, it is unlikely to have been applied to

²⁰⁷ Cf. Knibb 1994a, p.172; Nickelsburg 1992, pp.653-654.

²⁰⁸ Note further the association with the ‘holy ones’ (קְדוֹשִׁים; 1QH^a 12.25; cf. CD 5.20 – 6.11a), the term יָחַד (1QH^a 12.24; cf. יָחִיד; CD 19.33 – 20.1; 20.10-15, 27-34) and ‘a spring of living water’ (מְבוֹעַ מַיִם חַיִּים; 1QH^a 16.16; cf. CD 19.33 – 20.1). It is further stated that those who listen to him ‘walk in the way of your heart’ (1QH^a 12.24; cf. CD 1.10-11a).

²⁰⁹ See n.188 above.

the same figure described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ in CD 1.11 and 20.32, even though the latter while alive may well have been regarded in a messianic light (cf. CD 6.10-11a; 12.23 – 13.1). Instead a more convincing argument could be made for an identification with ‘the Prince of (all) the Congregation’ (cf. 4Q285 frag.5, 4) who, in our analysis of the Damascus Document, was seen to perhaps represent the renewed messianic expectations of the Yahad after the death of the ‘teacher’ (CD 7.18 – 8.1; cf. 19.10-11). However, the lack of a specific scriptural provenance for the form משיח הצדק and the ready availability of the (messianic?) designation יורה הצדק in CD 6.10-11a offers the possibility that משיח הצדק constitutes a re-usage of the label (drawing in addition upon, and indeed suggested by, the ‘righteous branch’ of Jeremiah 23.5 and 33.15). Thus we may have at least two distinct examples of the designation יורה הצדק from the FSL being used and applied as a label in the ESL.²¹⁰

Our examination above has demonstrated that the sobriquets מורה and מטיף הכזב were not in use in the ESL. There does exist however, arguably as a direct result of יורה הצדק in the FSL, the use of related indefinite forms (מטיף כזב and מורה צדק). It is these, more than any other designations in the ESL, that would appear key to the eventual development of the forms מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב.

²¹⁰ Furthermore, 1QH^a 16.16 may similarly reflect a deliberate use of CD 6.10-11a (see n.125 above).

4.

Late Sectarian Layer

4.1. Introduction

The final textual layer to be examined consists of those compositions which we have classed as belonging to the 'Late Sectarian Layer'. Again the purpose of such a broad designation is simply to distinguish these texts from those which would appear to represent earlier sectarian textual strata; it is not to suggest that they necessarily reflect a homogeneous group. Similarly no assumption is made as to the specific period of authorship in relation to the life of the 'Yahad', only that, broadly speaking, these texts would appear on literary grounds to post-date those examined in previous chapters.

For our present investigation, this Late Sectarian Layer (LSL) consists solely of P-material.¹ There is perhaps therefore a greater deal of homogeneity than is evident in the ESL, though, as indicated above, such should not be assumed *a priori*. We shall proceed, as in previous chapters, by examining each text in turn for evidence primarily of the development and employment of the oppositional sobriquets מַטִּיף הַכּוֹז and מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק (though noting the presence of related terminology where appropriate). We turn first to the Pesher on Habakkuk.

¹ Made up predominantly of 'continuous pesharim', though also of note is the 'thematic pesher', 4QCatena A (4Q177). Note however Brooke's recent observation that "the long-standing distinction between continuous and thematic commentaries no longer serves such a useful function as once it did" (2005a, p.135).

4.2. Sobriquets in the Late Sectarian Layer

4.2.1. 1QPesher on Habakkuk

4.2.1.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'

1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a

The first passage we shall examine is from the initial two columns of the Pesher on Habakkuk:

^{1.10}“Therefore the law is relaxed.” ¹¹[Its interpretation: ...] who rejected the law of God. ¹²“And judgement does not go forth to victory for the wicked {רשע} surroun]ds the righteous {הצדיק}.” ¹³[Its interpretation: ‘the wicked’ is ... and ‘the righteous’] is מורה הצדק ¹⁴[... “Therefore] judgement goes forth ¹⁵[perverted.” Its interpretation: ...] and not [... ¹⁶... “Look, traitors, and see, ¹⁷and be astonished, shocked, for a work is being done in your days that you would not believe if] ^{2.1}it were told.” [...The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with אשׁ הכוזב ², for [they did] not [believe in the words of] מורה הצדקה ³from the mouth of ³God; and it concerns the trait[ors of the] new [covenant] f[o]r they did not ⁴believe in the covenant of God [...] his holy na[me]; ⁵and likewise the interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the end of ⁶days. They are violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe ⁷when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation from the mouth of ⁸the priest {הכוהן} in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all ⁹the words of his servants, the prophets, by [whose] hand God has proclaimed ¹⁰all that is coming upon his people and [...]. (1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a)

Though highly fragmentary, the formulaic structure attested in both the remainder of the text and other ‘continuous pesharim’ has allowed some reconstruction of the passage.² Significantly however, 1QpHab 1.13 preserves the designation מורה הצדק, our first actual encounter with this ‘standard’ form of the sobriquet. Its similarity to the label מורה צדק found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (CD 1.11; 20.32) indicates that there may be some relation between the two. The presence of the definite article however suggests a

² There is still disagreement with regard to the reconstruction of *pesher* elements however. For example, while ה[...ה] אשר נתן אל ב[...ה] (1QpHab 2.8) is rendered ‘the priest in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng’ (as above) by the majority of scholars (e.g. Brownlee 1979; Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a), other reconstructions include ‘the Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the commun]ity’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), ‘the Priest whom God placed in [the House of Jud]ah’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961) and, in William Brownlee’s original reconstruction, ‘the priest whom He has given unto the Ch[ildren of Israel for a teach]er’ (Brownlee 1948).

titular function for מורה הצדק and thus the familiar rendering ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (cf. Chapter One, n.54).³

Intriguingly, an apparent variation on מורה הצדק appears in 1QpHab 2.2: מורה הצדקה. An additional *hē* provides צדקה while the definite article has been added above the line as a scribal correction. The latter is significant as, if the designation as a whole is to be considered a scribal error for מורה הצדק, when מורה צדקה was corrected to מורה הצדקה why was the final *hē* not cancelled?⁴ We must assume therefore that the use of צדקה was deliberate.

With regard to translation, all commentators have effectively considered מורה הצדקה a variant of מורה הצדק and so translated in identical fashion.⁵ Håkan Bengtsson suggests that there is “no difference in meaning” between the

³ So too the following translations: Brownlee 1948; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a. Note also, ‘the Righteous Teacher’ (Brownlee 1979; Horgan 2002). Isaac Rabinowitz renders the designation ‘the guide of righteousness’ (Rabinowitz 1958). However, he argues that צדק should be *understood* in “the collective sense” so that the title “means ‘the leader of the righteous’ rather than ‘one who teaches righteousness’” (1958, p.397). He draws a persuasive parallel with the designation מורה / יורה היחיד (CD 20.1; 20.14), indicating that here too the object denotes a collective entity (taking היחיד as a variant of היחיד). Nevertheless, his treatment of Hosea 10.12 and Joel 2.23 is unconvincing and he fails ultimately to take account of the *qualifying nature* seemingly apparent among other sobriquets. Thus צדק, as with כזב, חלקות and לצון, is best understood as a qualification of the former noun (in this case מורה). While Rabinowitz is content however to maintain the translation ‘the guide of righteousness’ (reflecting “the practice of the ancient authors”; 1958, p.394, n.2), John Reeves (1988) argues forcefully that מורה (ה)צדק should be more accurately rendered the ‘True Lawgiver’. Having already engaged with this position in Chapter Three, in reference to משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3), our conclusion still stands that ‘righteousness’ remains a valid rendering of צדק in the sectarian literature, incorporating a plurality of associated connotations where appropriate (including ‘true’, ‘legitimate’ and ‘just’; cf. Kim 1985, pp.153-191).

⁴ On scribal correction procedures, see Tov 1999.

⁵ E.g. Brownlee 1948; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Rabinowitz 1950; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a. Cf. Schiffman 1994, pp.117-121. Håkan Bengtsson erroneously suggests that Brownlee utilises the rendering ‘the Teacher of Right’ in 1QpHab 2.2 (as opposed to ‘the Righteous Teacher’; e.g. 1QpHab 1.13) in order to signify the form מורה הצדקה (2000a, p.198). In fact, Brownlee simply uses (in a somewhat questionable fashion) ‘the Righteous Teacher’ to translate מורה הצדק where it is seemingly set in opposition to ‘the Wicked Priest’ while using ‘the Teacher of Right’ in the context of ‘the Man / Spouter of the Lie’ (1979, pp.46-47). He thus uses the latter rendering both of מורה הצדקה in 1QpHab 1.16 – 2.10 and מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 5.8-12 (1979; 1982, p.22).

two (2000a, p.198; cf. p.215, n.207). Such begs the question however as to why צדקה and not צדק as immediately above (1QpHab 1.13). Brownlee proposes that:

The variation must have been made for emphasis. (Brownlee 1979, p.55)

Though possible, this explanation is rather unconvincing with no indication as to what specifically might be achieved by such a variant or why it fails to be used of the ‘teacher’ elsewhere. It may well be that a satisfactory explanation is beyond us, though a potential avenue for further investigation should involve some discussion of the use of צדקה both in scriptural texts and among the sectarian literature. For example, we have already highlighted in Chapter Three the presence of צמח צדקה (‘a righteous branch’) in Jeremiah 33.15 and speculated as to the influence this may have had upon the messianic expectations of the movement. Sung-Hae Kim further notes that in Deuteronomy, while צדק appears “always in the sense of right judgement, just weight, or lawful sacrifice”, צדקה is used of “human righteousness” and “conveys mainly human moral responsibility as one’s righteousness” (1985, p.160; cf. Koehler and Baumgartner 1996). Within the sectarian texts, צדקה is to be found most frequently in the Community Rule documents (that which we might deem S-material: 1QS; 4Q255-64; 5Q11) and the Hodayot.⁶ Of particular note is 1QH^a 19.7 which, following the phrase ותתן בפי הודות (19.4), continues:

And I know that truth is your mouth {פיכה} and righteousness {צדקה} in your hand. (1QH^a 19.7)

⁶ Cf. Abegg, Bowley and Cook 2003; Kuhn (ed.) 1960. Note also CD 8.14; 19.27; 20.20.

Perhaps some resemblance can here be found to '[the words of] מורה צדקה from the mouth of God' (1QpHab 2.2-3) in as much as צדקה emanates from God (cf. 1QH^a 9.26-27; 12.30-31).⁷

The concept of divinely authorised teaching has already been noted in both the Hodayot (e.g. 1QH^a 16.16-17) and the Damascus Document (e.g. CD 1.10-11a).⁸ The latter associates such with one labelled מורה צדק; there is thus a contextual link with the similar designation מורה הצדק(ה). Also of interest is our discussion of צדיק, 'the righteous (one)', in our examination of the Hodayot in Chapter Three (e.g. 1QH^a 7.17b-22a). There we speculated that this commonplace scriptural type may subsequently have been read and understood by sectarian readers in the retrospective light of 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.⁹ Here in the Peshar on Habakkuk such an understanding is made explicit and מורה הצדק of Habakkuk 1.4 is identified as a veiled reference to מורה הצדק (1QpHab 1.12-13). Noting this, Joseph Baumgarten comments that:

The title *Moreh ha-Sedeq* can be fathomed only if we take account of the role of personified *Sedeq* in Qumran thought. (J.M. Baumgarten 1979, p.233)

Such would appear to lie also behind the interpretation of Hosea 10.12 in CD 6.2-11a of the FSL.

⁷ It may also be significant that Joel 2.23 attests the form המורה לצדקה: 'O children of Zion, be glad and rejoice in the LORD your God; for he has given the early rain for your vindication {את־המורה לצדקה}, he has poured down for you abundant rain, the early and the later rain, as before' (Joel 2.23). Cf. Lim 2002, p.75. Note that in Russell Fuller's initial analysis of Hosea 10.12 in 4Q82 (4QXII⁸) he read יורי צדקה (1992, pp.254-256), though later amended to ירי צדק (1997, pp.282-285; cf. MT: ירה צדק). See further our discussion of Joel 2.23 and Hosea 10.12 in Chapter Two.

⁸ Indeed James Bowley argues that, while נביא is not used of the 'teacher', such divine authorisation should be taken as indicative of 'true prophecy' as opposed to that preached by those disparagingly given the titles 'prophets' and 'seers' (e.g. 1QH^a 12.9-20; cf. Micah 3.5-8). He even draws a comparison, as we have, with CD 5.20 – 6.2 and the past opposition depicted there between 'the holy anointed ones' and those who 'prophesied falsehood' (1999, pp.365, 371-373). In this light it is interesting to note that '[the words of] מורה צדקה from the mouth of God' (1QpHab 2.2-3) has an antithesis already seen in the Hodayot: 'in the mouth of prophets of a lie, deceived by error' (1QH^a 12.16). Cf. Bengtsson 2000a, p.198.

⁹ See Chapter Three, n.108.

That ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ is opposed by ‘traitors’ (הבוגדים) associated with ‘the Man of the Lie’ (איש הכוזב; 1QpHab 2.1-3) recalls the same descriptions used to denote opposition to ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (מורה / יורה היחיד) in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (cf. CD 19.33 – 20.1; 20.10-15). The latter figure is seemingly identical to one described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מורה צדק) and similarly opposed by traitors in CD 1.10-17. This מורה צדק is invested with divine authority, has a didactic function and adherence to his voice is a defining feature of those considered loyal to the Yahad (CD 1.10-11a; 20.27-34). These same features appear in the current passage with regard to מורה הצדק(ה) (1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a).¹⁰ Taken in conjunction with the terminological similarities (only the definite article distinguishes מורה הצדק from מורה צדק), it is tempting to speculate that we have here a different form of the *same* designation found in the ESL. The presence of the definite article, however, appears to represent a shift from a descriptive function to an appellative or titular one. Hence the sobriquet ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ may attest a development from the indefinite

¹⁰ This passage also mentions ‘the priest’ (הכֹהֵן) who, being similarly accredited with these three features and opposed by ‘traitors’ (1QpHab 2.5-10), could arguably be taken as a further description of מורה הצדק(ה) (Brownlee 1979, p.57; Knibb 1994a, p.223). Note also the following similarity:

‘the interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the end of days. They are violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation {הדור האחרון} from the mouth of the priest {הכֹהֵן} in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng’. (1QpHab 2.5-10)

‘But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him with a whole heart, and he raised up for them a teacher of righteousness {מורה צדק} to lead them in the way of his heart. And he made known to later generations what he had done to the last generation {דור אחרון}, a congregation of traitors.’ (CD 1.10-12)

Some scholars have taken the usage of the term to indicate that the figure labelled ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ was not only a priest, but must have been more specifically an ousted High Priest (cf. Murphy-O’Connor 1974, pp.229-233; Stegemann 1991, p.200; 1992, pp.148-166). Such a leap has met with some criticism however (e.g. Charlesworth 1980, pp.218-222). The term הכֹהֵן functions primarily as a label; all it really tells us is that the ‘teacher’ could be considered in priestly terms by his adherents. They may even have considered him the priest *par excellence* though such does not necessarily entail that he was ever recognised as a priest outside of his own movement.

description ‘a teacher of righteousness’, perhaps rivalling (or replacing?) the previous title by which this figure was labelled, ‘the Teacher of the Community’. In order to assess the validity of these suppositions, let us turn to the other passages from the Pesher on Habakkuk concerning ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’.

1QpHab 5.8-12

A number of the same themes found in 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a reappear in the following passage from the fifth column of the manuscript:

^{5.8}“Why do you stare, traitors, and keep silent when ⁹a wicked one {רשע} swallows up one more righteous than he {צדיק ממנו}?” Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom ¹⁰and the men of their council who kept silent at the rebuke of מורה הצדק ¹¹and did not help him against איש הכזב – who rejected החררה ¹²in the midst of all their council. (1QpHab 5.8-12)

The sobriquet מורה הצדק appears in the same form here as at 1QpHab 1.13 and should accordingly be rendered ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ in identical fashion.¹¹ The figure so labelled is again set in opposition to ‘traitors’ (appearing in the lemma and identified in the pesher as ‘the House of Absalom and the men of their council’; 1QpHab 5.9-10) and ‘the Man of the Lie’ (איש הכזב; 1QpHab 5.11). He is also identified as the referent of צדיק (again juxtaposed with רשע) as at 1QpHab 1.12-13.

The cited passage differs from the MT of Habakkuk 1.13b; rather than God looking upon traitors, it is they themselves who look on while ‘a wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he’ (1QpHab 5.8-9). This reading is borne out by the interpretation concerning ‘the House of Absalom and the men of their council who kept silent at the rebuke of מורה הצדק and did not help him

¹¹ Note however that Brownlee, while translating ‘the Righteous Teacher’ at 1QpHab 1.13, here renders ‘the Teacher of Right’ (as at 1QpHab 2.2) in accordance with his custom in the context of ‘the Man / Spouter of the Lie’ (1979, pp.46-47, 93; 1982, p.22). This thesis remains sceptical of such an approach to the sobriquet (see n.5 above).

against the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 5.9-11).¹² It is also uncertain as to whether *בתוכחת מורה הצדק* refers to the 'rebuke' (or 'chastisement') *of* or *by* 'the Teacher of Righteousness'. The scriptural citation that 'a wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he' (1QpHab 5.8-9) would suggest an objective genitive is intended and that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is the one rebuked (presumably by 'the Man of the Lie', the apparent referent of *רשע*). Such an interpretation has likewise been adopted by the majority of scholars (e.g. Bengtsson 2000a, p.200; Bruce 1956, p.94; Burrows 1956, pp.147-148; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979, pp.33-34; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a).¹³

Thus the passage interprets Habakkuk 1.13b in reference to a confrontation between *מורה הצדק* and *איש הכוזב*, tacitly observed by 'the House of Absalom and the men of their council' (1QpHab 5.9-10) who made no protest when 'the Man of the Lie' rebuked 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'rejected the law {התורה} in the midst of all their council' (1QpHab 5.11-12). The terminological and contextual similarities between the use of the label *מורה* *הצדק* in 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a (cf. *מורה יִצְדָקָה*) and 5.8-12 indicate a common understanding of the designation; one that has significant overlaps with the use of *מורה צדק* in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document.

¹² Knibb 1994a, p.229. Note however *תחרי* (second-person singular) in the scriptural citation, in accordance with the MT (cf. Horgan 1979, p.33). On the significance of the Qumran-related scrolls for our understanding of the MT, see: Brooke 2000c; Brownlee 1959; 1964; Lim 1997; 2002, pp.54-63; Segal 2005; Skehan 1959; Tov 1991; Treballe-Barrera 2000; Ulrich 1999; 2000; 2001.

¹³ For the opposite interpretation, see: Brownlee 1979, pp.91-95 (though note 1948, p.17, n.38; cf. 1952, pp.17-18); Carmignac 1962a, pp.507-510; Lim 2005.

1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a

Greater insight into the sectarian understanding of the sobriquet מורה הצדק is to be gained from an extensive passage concerning the duration of ‘the last time’ or ‘final age’ (הקץ האחרון):¹⁴

^{7.1}And God told Habakkuk to write what was coming upon ²the last generation but the fulfilment of that time he did not make known to him. ³And as for what he says, “So that ^{he can run} who reads it”, ⁴its interpretation concerns מורה הצדק to whom God has made known ⁵all the mysteries {רזי} of the words of his servants, the prophets. “For there is still a vision ⁶for the appointed time, it witnesses to the end and does not lie.” ⁷Its interpretation: the last time {הקץ האחרון} will be extended and will go beyond all ⁸that the prophets said, for the mysteries of God {רזי אל} are wonderful. ⁹“If it tarries, wait for it, for it will surely come and not ¹⁰delay.” Its interpretation concerns the Men of Truth {אנשי האמת}, ¹¹the Doers of the Law {עושי התורה}, whose hands will not slacken from the service of ¹²the truth when the last time {הקץ האחרון} is extended beyond them, for ¹³all the times of God will come according to their determination as he decreed ¹⁴for them in the mysteries {רזי} of his prudence. “Behold, it is conceited, it is not upright ¹⁵[his soul within him.]” Its interpretation: they will double upon them ¹⁶[... and] n[ot] find favour when they are judged. [... ¹⁷... “But the righteous {צדיק} will live by their faithfulness.”] ¹⁸Its interpretation concerns all עושי התורה in the House of Judah, whom ²God will deliver from the house of judgement on account of their toil and their faith ³in מורה הצדק. (1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a)

The passage twice attests מורה הצדק (1QpHab 7.4; 8.3a). The first of these continues ‘to whom God has made known all the mysteries {רזי} of the words of his servants, the prophets’ (1QpHab 7.4-5). In the first instance, this recalls what is said of ‘the priest’ (הכֹהֵן) in 1QpHab 2.5-10, ‘in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all the words of his servants, the prophets’ (1QpHab 2.8-9), thus making an implied identification between the two more probable (see

¹⁴ This phrase is variously rendered ‘the final age’ (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004), ‘the final time’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961), ‘the final end’ (Brownlee 1948), ‘the last end-time’ (Horgan 1979), ‘the last period’ (Horgan 2002) or ‘the Last Days’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a). No one translation is entirely satisfactory, though all entail the same connotations. Noting the similarity to הדור האחרון (‘the last generation’; 1QpHab 2.7), we shall adopt ‘the last time’ as a terminologically consistent rendering of הקץ האחרון (so too Brownlee 1979; Knibb 1994a). The meaning is nevertheless that seemingly shared by the various translations above, denoting a final period of history. There are clear overlaps with the use of similar phrases in 1QPesher on Habakkuk expressing an interest in this period, such as הדור האחרון (1QpHab 2.7; 7.2) and אחרית הימים (1QpHab 2.5-6), though Annette Steudel warns against too close an identification (1993, pp.239-240).

n.10 above). Furthermore, however, it is reminiscent of what is said of ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (מלִּיץ דַּעַת) in the Hodayot:

^{10.13}But you have set me like a banner to the elect of righteousness, and a mediator of knowledge {מלִּיץ דַּעַת} of wonderful mysteries {רָזִי פִּלְאָ}, to test ¹⁴[the men of] truth and to try those who love instruction. (1QH^a 10.13-14)

‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ of the LSL is described as being party to ‘mysteries’ (רָזִי) as was the ‘mediator of knowledge’ (i.e. the protagonist of the Hodayot) in the ESL.¹⁵ This may prove significant given the oft-held assumption that the ‘teacher’ himself authored the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’ (or was at least considered retrospectively to have done so).¹⁶

In 1QPesher on Habakkuk, ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ is thus seemingly portrayed in the role of a ‘divinely inspired exegete’ (cf. Bowley 1999, p.371). Maurya Horgan notes that:

The word *rāz* is a Persian loan-word that does not occur in biblical Hebrew but is found in biblical Aramaic (Horgan 1979, p.237)¹⁷

Accordingly, John Barton, examining ‘prophetic foreknowledge of the present day’, draws comparisons with the book of Daniel in which רָזִי are similarly interpreted (1986, pp.179-213; cf. Knibb 1994a, p.233).¹⁸ Our present text details the ‘mysteries’ here concerned as ‘the words of his servants, the prophets’ (1QpHab 7.5) which require interpretation to elucidate ‘all that is coming upon his people’ (1QpHab 2.8-10). Such an approach would appear characteristic of the pesharim in general.¹⁹

That 1QH^a 10.13-14 may bear some relation to the description of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מֹרֶה הַצִּדִּיק) as one ‘to whom God has made known

¹⁵ Note also 1QH^a 12.27-28; 15.26-27; 24[bottom].5.

¹⁶ See Chapter Three, esp. n.109 and n.140.

¹⁷ Also in later Hebrew (Horgan 1979, pp.37-38).

¹⁸ Note in particular Daniel 2.

¹⁹ See further: Brooke 1981; Lim 2002.

all the mysteries {רזי} of the words of his servants, the prophets' (1QpHab 7.4-5) is further suggested by the presence in 1QpHab 7.10 of אנשי האמת, 'the Men of Truth'. The same designation, though notably without the definite article, appears in 1QH^a 10.13-14 denoting the audience for whom the 'mysteries' are conveyed. Aside from ascertaining a probable link between the two passages, it is perhaps significant in itself that אנשי אמת of the ESL (cf. 1QH^a 6.2) is rendered אנשי האמת in the LSL, a phenomenon we have already noted of מורה צדק (ESL) and מורה הצדק (LSL). The אנשי האמת are here described as:

^{7.11}the Doers of the Law {עושי התורה}, whose hands will not slacken from the service of ¹²the truth when the last time {הקץ האחרון} is extended beyond them (1QpHab 7.11-12).

This phrase, עושי התורה ('the Doers of the Law'; Bengtsson 2000a, pp.217-234; Brownlee 1979), is also found at the end of our present passage as the apparent referent of צדיק:²⁰

^{7.17}"But the righteous {צדיק} will live by their faithfulness." ^{8.1}Its interpretation concerns all עושי התורה in the House of Judah, whom ²God will deliver from the house of judgement on account of their toil and their faith ³in מורה הצדק. (1QpHab 7.17 – 8.3)

It is notable that, in this instance, צדיק is interpreted as those who are loyal *to* מורה הצדק rather than in direct reference to the sobriquet itself (cf. 1QpHab 1.12-13; 5.8-12). Perhaps we might recall here the other phrase employed alongside (and seemingly synonymous with) אנשי [אנשי] אמת in 1QH^a 10.13-14, 'the elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק).

The passage concerns itself with הקץ האחרון ('the last time'; see n.14 above), and in particular both the 'unforeseen' extension of the age and an emphasis on not losing faith.

²⁰ Alternatively, 'those who keep/observe the Law' (e.g. Vermes 2004).

^{7.5}“For there is still a vision ⁶for the appointed time, it witnesses to the end and does not lie.” ⁷Its interpretation: the last time {הַקֵּץ הָאַחֲרֹן} will be extended and will go beyond all ⁸that the prophets said, for the mysteries of God {רָזִי אֵל} are wonderful. (1QpHab 7.5-8)

Indeed the pesher serves as a reassurance that all is as it should be and that ‘all the times of God will come according to their determination as he decreed for them in the mysteries {רָזִי} of his prudence’ (1QpHab 7.13-14). While the topic is suggested by the lemma (a primacy we must acknowledge), the pesher would appear to be grappling more specifically with eschatological disappointment; the ‘appointed time’ has passed and thus requires explanation.²¹

We are reminded of the apparent renewed messianic expectations in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document following the death of the ‘teacher’ (e.g. CD 19.33 – 20.1) and the insistence in CD 20.27-34 on adherence to הַתּוֹרָה (the ‘well’ of CD 6.2-11a; cf. Num 21.18) and continued loyalty to ‘the voice of מוֹרֶה צֶדֶק’. These same features are to be found in our present passage in, for example, the reference to עוֹשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה in the House of Judah, whom God will deliver from the house of judgement on account of their toil and their faith in מוֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק (1QpHab 8.1-3).²² It is these ‘whose hands will not slacken from the service of the truth when the last time {הַקֵּץ הָאַחֲרֹן} is extended beyond them’ (1QpHab 7.11-12). Might the eschatological disappointment implied in 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a likewise be bound up with the

²¹ The same conclusion is reached by John Collins, who adds: “It is reasonable to infer, then, that the “end” was expected shortly before the pesher was written” (1997, p.83; cf. Steudel 1993, pp.235-236; Talmon 1989, p.296).

²² As opposed to, for example, ‘the Man of the Lie’ who ‘rejected הַתּוֹרָה in the midst of all their council’ (1QpHab 5.11-12). Phillip Callaway similarly highlights that: “The reference to the faithfulness of the Doers of the Law to the Teacher of Righteousness does suggest that the former lived *after* the Teacher” (1988, p.152; my italics).

death of the figure considered to be the anticipated ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (CD 6.11a)?²³

Philip Davies suggests along these lines that the text as a whole might reflect a reassessment of the role of the ‘teacher’ in the light of his death, highlighting the deliberate reinterpretation of the term **רִבִּי** from the Hodayot in reference to ‘the words of his servants, the prophets’ (1QpHab 7.5):

That is, “mysteries” are now scriptural texts, and “knowledge” is their interpretation. What does this suggest? Not that a new kind of treatment of scripture is being developed – for the principle of such inspired exegesis is much older – but that the original teaching of the founder of the community is now being transformed into something more (or perhaps, less) than it originally was. Instead of a religious leader and lawgiver, the “Teacher” has become the founder of a school of exegesis. ... It explains, however, one of the ways in which religious communities sustain and redefine themselves after the removal of their founder, and especially encourage their faith in times of distress by assuring themselves that all was foretold and that they will be secure in that knowledge. (Davies 1987, p.104)

We have noted that there would indeed appear to be evidence of some dependence upon both the Hodayot and the Damascus Document. With regard to the latter, another possibility presents itself; rather than the death of the ‘teacher’ *per se*, might the eschatological disappointment in 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a stem from the passing of the *revised* ‘end-date’, anticipated forty years after his death in CD 20.13-15?²⁴ Such would place the authorship of 1QPesher on Habakkuk some forty years at least after the death of the ‘teacher’, a proposal not incongruent with our analysis of the relevant texts so far.²⁵ Concerning CD 20.13-15 and its lack of specificity, John Collins suggests:

Nonetheless, as the years passed, they were aware that the end time was prolonged. “About forty years” could not be extended indefinitely. The lack of a specific date, however, mitigated the disappointment and made it easier for the community to adapt to the postponement of their expectations. (Collins 1997, p.85)

²³ In this light, might **הַקֵּץ הָאַחֲרֹן** refer obliquely to **קֵץ חֲרוֹן** (‘the time of wrath’; CD 1.5), the period during which **מִוֶּרֶה צָדֵק** was raised up according to the Damascus Document? Collins suggests that **הַקֵּץ הָאַחֲרֹן** is a deliberate wordplay on **קֵץ חֲרוֹן** (1997, p.81; 2000a).

²⁴ Cf. Collins 1997, pp.82-85; Steudel 1993, pp.238-239.

²⁵ Note also Bengtsson: “There is nothing in 1QpHab which hints that the Teacher was still alive when it was written” (2000a, p.228, n.64).

Adaptation to this postponement would indeed appear to be evidenced in 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a.

This passage from 1QPesher on Habakkuk presents מורה הצדק as an authoritative figure (of the past?) and seemingly draws upon 1QH^a 10.13-14 for both the ‘mysteries’ (רזים) to which he is party and ‘the Men of Truth’ who are associated with him (thus implicitly identifying him with מליץ דעת). The pesher on Habakkuk 2.3 is keen to demonstrate, in the face of “hope for an imminent messianic age amongst the members of the ‘New covenant’” (Talmon 1951, p.36), that the extension of הקץ האחרון is on account of such ‘mysteries’ (1QpHab 7.5-14) but that ‘all the times of God will come according to their determination’ (1QpHab 7.13).²⁶ In the meantime, *continued* adherence to התורה and loyalty to מורה הצדק are encouraged (1QpHab 7.9 – 8.3a), in accordance with the recommendations originally made in response to the death of the ‘teacher’ in CD 20.27-34.

1QpHab 9.8-12a

The following passage is the first of two in 1QPesher on Habakkuk in which הכוהן הרשע is set in opposition to מורה הצדק:

^{9.8}“Because of human bloodshed and violence to the land, the town and all ^{who dwell} in it.”
⁹Its interpretation concerns הכוהן הרשע whom, because of wrong done to מורה הצדק¹⁰ and the men of his council, God gave into the hand of his enemies to humble him ¹¹with disease, to destroy him in bitterness of soul because he had done wickedly ¹²against his elect {בחירו}. (1QpHab 9.8-12a)

Here ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ is associated with a group designated ‘the men of his council’ (אנשי עצתו; 1QpHab 9.10). There is some dispute as to whether עצתו should be rendered ‘council’ or ‘counsel’ in this context (cf.

²⁶ Indeed, Steudel suggests that the pesharim texts themselves were “aimed exclusively at proving that the end was near because a book of the Prophets was completely fulfilled” (1993, pp.241-242). See too: Berrin 2005, pp.116-117; Stegemann 1998, pp.128-129.

Koehler and Baumgartner 1995). John Worrell, drawing upon scriptural use of the term (e.g. Isaiah 40.13: **אִישׁ עֲצָתוֹ**; Psalms 119.24: **אֲנָשִׁי עֲצָתִי**), suggests ‘counsel’ to be “the consistently preferable rendering” (1970, p.71), though does allow that:

there are also strong indications that it approached the status of a technical denomination for an important factor in their community structure. (Worrell 1970, p.68)

Though either translation is possible, both are to a degree synonymous and should accordingly cause us no great concern.²⁷ For our purposes, either understanding would render **אֲנָשִׁי עֲצָתוֹ** a body of supporters or men of association, as with ‘the House of Absalom and the men of their council {**אֲנָשִׁי עֲצָתָם**} who kept silent at the rebuke of **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק** (1QpHab 5.9-10).²⁸

Instead of **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** (as in 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a or 5.8-12), the figure placed in opposition to **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק** in 1QpHab 9.8-12a is labelled **הַכֹּזֵב הַרָשָׁע**, unambiguous enough in form to warrant the common translation, ‘the Wicked Priest’.²⁹ We shall return to this sobriquet in an excursus as part of our examination of ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ in the Pesher on Habakkuk below. For the present however it will suffice to highlight that ‘the Wicked Priest’ is accused of having wronged ‘the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council’ and is given by God ‘into the hand of his enemies’ (1QpHab 9.10) ‘because he had done wickedly against his (i.e. God’s) elect {**בְּחִירוֹ**}’ (9.11-12). The referent of this last phrase (**בְּחִירוֹ**) must be either **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק** if singular (so Bengtsson 2000a, pp.205-206) or **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק וְאֲנָשִׁי עֲצָתוֹ** if a defective plural (so Brownlee

²⁷ As Brownlee notes, “what is a ‘council’ but ‘men of counsel’?” (1979, p.155). He suggests however that the reference is probably to an ‘organised group’ and so prefers the translation, ‘council’ (so too Bengtsson 2000a, p.205).

²⁸ On the basis of such an understanding, Horgan (1979) renders ‘his / their partisans’.

²⁹ Cf. Brownlee 1948; 1979; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a.

1948, p.17, n.34; Horgan 1979).³⁰ In favour of the latter interpretation, Horgan notes that it is the plural **בְּחִירֵי אֵל** that appears in 1QpHab 10.13 while the form **בְּחִירֵי**, seemingly with a plural understanding, is attested also in 1QpHab 5.4 and elsewhere among the pesharim.³¹ Brownlee argues that the singular may well be preferable but, if so, “should be interpreted as a collective” (1979, p.86; cf. pp.87, 157); in which case we should identify ‘his elect’ (1QpHab 9.12) with not only ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ but also ‘the men of his council’ (1QpHab 9.10). Might **עֲצָתוֹ אֲנָשִׁי** bear some relation to ‘the Men of Truth, the Doers of the Law’ (1QpHab 7.10-11), associated with **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק** in 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a?³² In this context it may be informative to recall ‘the elect of righteousness’ (**בְּחִירֵי צֶדֶק**), associated in 1QH^a 10.13-14 with ‘a mediator of knowledge’ and seemingly synonymous with the ‘men of truth’.

1QpHab 11.2-8

The final passage from 1QPesher on Habakkuk to be examined in relation to the sobriquet **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק** is the second in which this figure is set in opposition to **הַכּוֹהֵן הַרָשָׁע**:

^{11.2}“Woe to him who makes his neighbour drink, pouring out ³his anger, making him drunk so as to look upon their festivals.” ⁴Its interpretation concerns **הַכּוֹהֵן הַרָשָׁע**, who ⁵pursued **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק**, to swallow him up in the heat of ⁶his anger, to the house of his exile. And at the time of the festival, the rest of ⁷the Day of Atonement {**יּוֹם הַכִּפּוּרִים**}, he appeared to them to swallow them up ⁸and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, the sabbath of their rest. (1QpHab 11.2-8)

³⁰ Note Qimron 1986, pp.33-35.

³¹ E.g. **עֲדָת בְּחִירֵי** in 4Q164 (frag.1, 3) and 4Q171 (2.5; 3.5). See Horgan 1979, pp.32, 44; cf. Bengtsson 2000a, p.206, n.155.

³² Bengtsson wishes to disassociate the two groups, suggesting that **עוֹשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה**, is a more theologically distinguished label than **אֲנָשִׁי עֲצָתוֹ**, which appears to be some sort of organised circle around the Teacher” (2000a, p.205). It is not clear however that the two labels must on these grounds designate distinct groups. Indeed a more convincing argument for such a distinction would be that **אֲנָשִׁי עֲצָתוֹ** are presented as contemporary to the ‘teacher’ and share in the wrong done to him, while **עוֹשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה** of 1QpHab 7.9 – 8.3a would appear to post-date this figure (see n.22 above).

The form attested is once again מורה הצדק, to be rendered ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’.³³ The text of Habakkuk 2.15 here exhibits some variance from the Masoretic Text, in particular the employment of מועדיהם (‘their festivals’) rather than מעוריהם (MT: ‘their nakedness’).³⁴ This is followed up by the reference to קץ מועד (1QpHab 11.6) in the pesher and strongly echoes an allusion found in one of the ‘Teacher Hymns’ of the Hodayot:

^{12.11}And they withhold the drink of knowledge from the thirsty, and for their thirst give them vinegar to drink so as to look upon ¹²their error, that they act like fools in their festivals, so they are caught in their nets. (1QH^a 12.11-12)

A cursory glance at the immediately preceding passage from 1QH^a (examined in Chapter Three) uncovers yet more similarities between the two texts:

^{12.8}For (I) have been rejected by them and they do not esteem me when you make yourself great through me. For they banish me from my land ⁹like a bird from its nest, and all my friends and my acquaintances have been driven from me and esteem me as a broken vessel. But they are mediators of ¹⁰a lie and seers of deceit, they have schemes of Belial against me, to change your law which you engraved in my heart for smooth things ¹¹for your people. (1QH^a 12.8-11a)

The H- and P-material have in common reference to exile and error in festivals, both specifics absent from the MT of Habakkuk 2.15. An implicit association is thus made between ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ of 1QpHab and the protagonist of the Hodayot.³⁵

Philip Davies utilises these passages to highlight the probable dependence of the pesharim upon the Hodayot, noting further that the intention of ‘the Wicked Priest’ to ‘swallow him (i.e. מורה הצדק up) (לבלעו; 1QpHab 11.5;

³³ Cf. ‘the Righteous Teacher’ (Brownlee 1979; Horgan 2002).

³⁴ See primarily Brownlee 1959, though also: Bengtsson 2000a, pp.75-78; Brownlee 1979, pp.179-189; Harris 1966, pp.33-35; Lim 2002, pp.54-63. Cf. n.12 above.

³⁵ Such would support either a strict identification of the two or the more moderate assertion that the Hodayot were *considered* to represent (auto)biographical details of the life of ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’. See Chapter Three, esp. n.109 and n.140; cf. Davies 1987, pp.87-105.

cf. 11.7) seemingly draws upon the reference to schemes of ‘Belial’ (בל יעל) in 1QH^a 12.10.³⁶ As a result, the reliability of the pesharim for the reconstruction of historical scenarios is potentially undermined (the very foundation upon which a number of the hypotheses examined in Chapter One are based). For our purposes however, the accuracy of such historical information need not concern us; it is the understanding of, and connotations associated with, these sobriquets across the different sectarian texts and textual layers that is our focus. Consequently whether or not a historical confrontation, such as that detailed in 1QpHab 11.2-8, did indeed take place is not as important as the fact that a figure labelled מורה הצדק was *understood within the text* (and thus also perhaps by subsequent readers) to have come into conflict with הכוהן הרשע. The work of Davies is crucial however in allowing us to trace the development of such ideas through the texts themselves.³⁷

In accordance with 1QH^a 12.8-12, 1QpHab 11.2-8 conceives ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ as being in exile.³⁸ Hindy Najman, in her recent examination of the concept of wilderness, identifies this as an implied “locus of suffering and isolation” (2006, p.104), in which separation from the temple results in the state of wilderness. In establishing the conflict between מורה הצדק and הכוהן הרשע as having occurred on ‘the Day of Atonement’ (יום הכפורים; 1QpHab 11.7), the text further hints at calendrical differences underlying the dispute.³⁹ As in 1QpHab 9.8-12a, ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ is here presented as an object of persecution by ‘the Wicked Priest’ and is implicitly to be understood against

³⁶ See Davies 1987, pp.93-97. Note however בלע in Habakkuk 1.13 (cf. 1QpHab 5.8-12).

³⁷ Accordingly, one question that should concern us is the presence of הכוהן הרשע in 1QpHab 11.2-8 when איש הכזב or מטיף הכזב would be more readily suggested by מליצי כזב and חוזי רמיה in 1QH^a 12.8-12 (cf. Davies 1987, pp.96-97). We shall return to this in the excursus below on הכוהן הרשע in the Peshar on Habakkuk.

³⁸ Note Sukenik (ed.) 1955, p.39.

³⁹ See in particular Talmon 1989 (pp.186-199) and 1999. In both of these essays, Talmon also highlights a similar calendrical dispute between Rabban Gamaliel and Rabbi Joshua, drawing several notable parallels with the apparent case of 1QpHab 11.2-8. See further, J.M. Baumgarten 1999; Stern 2000. Cf. CD 6.18-19.

the typology of the righteous sufferer in the Psalms (Kim 1985, pp.170-173) and, more specifically, the suffering protagonist of the Hodayot.

Summary

Despite its unequivocal absence in the FSL and ESL, the sobriquet מורה is to be found six times in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5). A seventh occasion witnesses the slightly different form, מורה הצדקה (1QpHab 2.2). While an altogether convincing explanation could not be reached for the presence of this variant, it is significant that the definite article was added above the line as a scribal correction; thus, unlike מורה צדק of CD 1.11 and 20.32, each occurrence of the designation in the Pesher on Habakkuk is definite.

Some relation to the ‘teacher’-designations found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document would appear nevertheless inescapable. There we observed that a figure, seemingly titled ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (מורה / יורה היחיד; CD 20.1; 20.14), had been acclaimed as the anticipated ‘one who will teach righteousness at the end of days’ (יורה הצדק באחרית) (הימים; CD 6.11a) and accordingly described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מורה צדק; CD 1.11; 20.32). He was perceived as having been invested with divine authority (CD 1.10-11a) and set in opposition to ‘traitors’ (CD 1.10-12; 19.33 – 20.1; 20.10-15) and ‘the Man of Scoffing / the Lie’ (איש הלצון / הכזב; CD 1.14; 20.15). After his death he continued to be venerated and adherence to ‘the voice of מורה צדק’ was marked as a defining feature of those considered loyal to the Yahad (CD 20.27-34). We also noted similar characteristics of the protagonist of the Hodayot, including his didactic function and divine authority (1QH^a 10.13-15a; 16.16-17), association with an ‘elect’ group (1QH^a 10.13-15a), his opposition to ‘traitors’, ‘scoffers’ and ‘mediators of a lie’ (1QH^a 10-12), and points of correspondence with descriptions of ‘the righteous (one)’ (צדיק; e.g. 1QH^a 7.17b-22a).

In similar fashion, the teachings of מורה הצדק (ה) in 1QPesher on Habakkuk are attributed divine authority (1QpHab 2.2-10a; 7.3-5), he is opposed by ‘traitors’ and ‘the Man of the Lie’ (1QpHab 2.1-10; 5.8-12) and there is emphasis on continued loyalty to him even though he would no longer appear to be present (1QpHab 8.1-3a). He is identified as the referent of צדיק where it appears in the lemma (1QpHab 1.12-13; 5.8-12; though cf. 7.17 – 8.3), linked with an elect group (1QpHab 9.8-12a) and implicitly associated with the protagonist of the Hodayot (1QpHab 11.2-8; cf. 1QH^a 12.8-12). If, as seems probable, we should associate the ‘teacher’-designations of the ESL with those of the Pesher on Habakkuk by means of some continuity, then our most striking observation must be that the title ‘the Teacher of the Community’ is unattested in 1QpHab and instead the description ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מורה צדק) acquires the definite article, thus providing the seemingly appellative form ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (מורה הצדק).⁴⁰

4.2.1.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’

1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a

For our examination of the sobriquet מטיף הכוזב in 1QPesher on Habakkuk we shall first return to 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a, initially explored with regard to מורה הצדק above:

^{1.10}“Therefore the law is relaxed.” ¹¹[Its interpretation: ...] who rejected the law of God. ¹²“And judgement does not go forth to victory for the wicked {רשע} surroun]ds the righteous {הצדיק}.” ¹³[Its interpretation: ‘the wicked’ is ... and ‘the righteous’] is מורה הצדק ¹⁴[... “Therefore] judgement goes forth ¹⁵[perverted.” Its interpretation: ...] and not [... ¹⁶... “Look, traitors, and see, ¹⁷and be astonished, shocked, for a work is being done in your days that you would not believe if] ^{2.1}it were told.” [...The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors {הבוגדים} with הכוזב ²איש, for [they did] not [believe in the words of] מורה הצדק ³from the mouth of God; and it concerns the trait[ors of the] new [covenant] f[o]r they did not ⁴believe in the covenant of God [...] his holy na[me]; ⁵and likewise the interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the end of ⁶days. They are violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe ⁷when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation {הדור האחרון} from the mouth of

⁴⁰ A phenomenon witnessed also of אנשי אמת (ESL) and אנשי האמת (LSL).

⁸the priest in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all ⁹the words of his servants, the prophets, by [whose] hand God has proclaimed ¹⁰all that is coming upon his people and [...]. (1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a)

While **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** is not encountered, there is a reference to **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** (1QpHab 2.1-2). This appears in exactly the same form as found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document in the ESL (CD 20.15). As there, so here we shall translate ‘the Man of the Lie’ (so too Brownlee 1948; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a).⁴¹

In our present passage, **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** is set in opposition to the ‘teacher’ and associated with ‘the traitors’ (**הַבֹּגְדִים**) who rejected ‘[the words of] **מֹרֶה** **הַצִּדְקָה** from the mouth of God’ (1QpHab 2.1-3). This constitutes part of a pesher on Habakkuk 1.5 which, in the MT, refers to **בְּגוֹיִם** (‘among the nations’); though the lemma is almost entirely missing, the pesher suggests that 1QpHab read **בֹּגְדִים** instead, in agreement with the Septuagint (see Horgan 2002, p.160, n.20).⁴² The word finds expression three times in the pesher: ‘the traitors with the Man of the Lie’ (1QpHab 2.1-2), ‘the traitors of the new covenant’ (1QpHab 2.3) and ‘the traitors in the end of days’ (1QpHab 2.5-6). Accordingly, many have identified three distinct groups of traitors, “traitors past, traitors present, and traitors yet to come” (Snyder 2000, p.39, n.44).⁴³ Phillip Callaway on the other hand distinguishes between only two groups of traitors: those of the past who rejected both the words of the ‘teacher’ and the ‘new covenant’ and associated themselves with ‘the Man of the Lie’ (1QpHab 2.1-4), and those contemporary to the pesharist, or of the future, who in ‘the end of days’ reject the words of ‘the

⁴¹ Cf. ‘the Man of Lies’ (Brownlee 1979; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996) and ‘the Liar’ (Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004).

⁴² Cf. Brownlee 1979, p.54; Callaway 1988, p.143; Harris 1966, p.28; Horgan 1979, pp.23, 246; Knibb 1994a, pp.222-223. See n.12 above.

⁴³ So too Brownlee 1979, pp.54-58; Grossman 2002, pp.155-156; Horgan 1979, pp.23-24; Knibb 1994a, p.223; VanderKam and Flint 2002, p.223.

priest' and are 'violator[s of the coven]ant' (1QpHab 2.5-10).⁴⁴ This interpretation is supported by the parallel structure of the dual pesher; both groups are seemingly introduced with פֶּשֶׁר הַדְּבָר עַל, express disbelief in the words of God's mediatory figure and reject 'the covenant'.⁴⁵ The only significant difference between the two is the tense of the verb.

Hence the text relates the lemma to traitors of the past, associated with the conflict between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Man of the Lie', and those of the present/future who are described in the same terms and thus presented as their ideological successors. We have already suggested that 'the priest' (הַכֹּהֵן; 1QpHab 2.8) should most likely be identified with 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (see n.10 above; cf. 1QpHab 7.4-5). Brownlee notes, as we have, that it was possible to 'listen to the voice' of the 'teacher' after his death (CD 20.27-34; i.e. his teachings could still be either accepted or rejected), and so we need not necessarily assume on the basis of 1QpHab 2.5-10 that he is still alive (Brownlee 1979, p.57). Accordingly, the contemporary traitors are those living *after* the time of the 'teacher' who nevertheless 'will not believe when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation' (1QpHab 2.6-7). They are therefore contrasted with 'the Men of Truth, the Doers of the Law' who accept the interpretations of the 'teacher' regarding 'the words of his servants, the prophets' and display loyalty to him (1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a; cf. CD 20.27-34).

The figure labelled 'the Man of the Lie' (אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב) is associated with the former traitors who rejected the 'teacher' and the 'new covenant' (בְּרִית הַחֲדָשָׁה; 1QpHab 2.1-4) and by implication thus belongs to an earlier age than the pesharist. This is congruent with what we know of אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב in the Damascus Document:

⁴⁴ Callaway 1988, pp.142-149. In so doing he follows the early observation of Sacha Stern (1950, p.25) and has the support of Bengtsson (2000a, pp.165-178) and Charlesworth (2002, pp.94-95).

⁴⁵ Note what is said of 'those who separate from your covenant' in 1QH^a 12.17-18: 'For they have not chosen in the way of your [heart] and have not listened to your word. For they said of the vision of knowledge, "It is not sure", and of the way of your heart, "It is not that".'

^{20.10}Like the judgement of their companions who turned back ¹¹with the Men of Scoffing they shall be judged, for they spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness and rejected ¹²the covenant {מאסו בברית} and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus; *and that is the new covenant {ברית החדשה}*. ¹³And there shall not be for them or their families a share in the house of the law. And from the day of ¹⁴the gathering in of the Teacher of the Community until the end of all the Men of War who turned back ¹⁵with איש הכוזב there will be about forty years. (CD 20.10-15)⁴⁶

While ‘traitors’ are not explicitly mentioned (though arguably implied), in Chapter Three we identified those who ‘turned back’ (שבו) in this passage with those who ‘turned’ (שבו) from the covenant in CD 19.33b – 20.1a:

^{19.33}Thus all the men who entered the new ³⁴covenant {ברית החדשה} in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed {ויבגדו} and departed from the well of living water ³⁵shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written from the day of the gathering in of ^{20.1}the Teacher of the Community until there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel. (CD 19.33b – 20.1a)

Accordingly, these defectors from the ‘new covenant’, set in opposition to the teacher and associated with ‘the Man of the Lie’, should be identified with ‘the traitors of the new covenant’ of 1QpHab 2.1-4.⁴⁷

That איש הכוזב in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document is seemingly identical to איש הלצון further suggests the potential significance of CD 1.10-15:

^{1.10}But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him with a whole heart, ¹¹*and he raised up for them a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart*. And he made known ¹²to later generations {דורות אחרונים} what he had done to *the last generation* {דור אחרון}, a congregation of traitors {עדת בוגדים}. ¹³*They are those who departed from the way. That was the time about which it is written, “like a stray heifer, ¹⁴so Israel strayed”, when arose איש הלצון who spouted to Israel ¹⁵waters of a lie and led them astray in a wilderness without a way* (CD 1.10-15).⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Italics signify a *later* gloss to the Yahadic text of the passage following Davies 1983 (p.263; cf. pp.176-186). See further, Chapter Three, n.31.

⁴⁷ Cf. Fabry 2003, pp.253-254.

⁴⁸ Italics signify the Yahadic glosses or expansions to the pre-Yahadic text, following Davies 1983 (pp.232-235; cf. pp.61-72).

The phrase ‘a congregation of traitors’ (עדת בוגדים; CD 1.12) from the original FSL text is here expanded upon and associated with איש הלצון in opposition to ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (מורה צדק; CD 1.11). It is also of note that the Yahadic redaction further identifies the עדת בוגדים with ‘the last generation’ (דור אחרון; CD 1.12), a designation similarly used in 1QpHab 1.16 – 2.10a to indicate the present generation (הדור האחרון; 1QpHab 2.7).⁴⁹ Thus the presentation of ‘the Man of the Lie’ in 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a is strikingly similar on both a thematic and terminological level to that found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document where this figure is further described as מטיף כוזב.⁵⁰

A source of more recent controversy with regard to the sobriquet איש הכוזב is the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.13:

^{1.12} [“And judgement does not go forth to victory for the wicked {רשע} surround]s the righteous {הצדיק}.” ¹³ [Its interpretation: ‘the wicked’ is ... and ‘the righteous’] is מורה הצדק (1QpHab 1.12-13).

Given its presence elsewhere in the text, almost all commentators have restored ‘the Wicked Priest’ (הכוהן הרשע) as a natural referent of רשע.⁵¹ However, Timothy Lim makes a convincing argument that ‘the Man of the Lie’ (איש הכוזב) should be restored instead (2000a; 2002, pp.35-36). ‘The Man of the Lie’ and ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ appear together just a few lines later (1QpHab

⁴⁹ Cf. Callaway 1988, pp.146-147.

⁵⁰ Note in addition the occurrence of בוגדים in 1QH^a 10.9b-11, associated also with ‘scoffers’. Bengtsson observes correctly that: “In the Hodayoth these ‘traitors’ appears not to be a reference to a specific group, but a general categorisation of enemies. However, in the Damascus Document the picture of ‘the traitors’ is more specific than in 1QH^a” (2000a, p.168). This may have implications for our understanding of the relationship between these two texts and would certainly agree with our observation that the general עדת בוגדים of the FSL (CD 1.12) undergoes further specification in the ESL (e.g. the addition of דור אחרון and the entirety of CD 1.13-18a).

⁵¹ For example, see even the preliminary publication by Brownlee (1948, pp.8, 16, n.12). Cf. Brownlee 1979; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Lohse 1981; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a. Note 4QpPs^a (4Q171) 4.7-10, to be examined below.

2.1-4), neither directly suggested by the immediately preceding lemma. While the ‘teacher’ is placed in this context by his appearance in 1QpHab 1.13, ‘the Man of the Lie’ is not grounded in the scriptural citation unless made the referent of רשע in 1QpHab 1.12-13.

Lim notes that the adjective רשע appears only one other time in Habakkuk 1-2 and in the pesher is there identified with איש הכוזב (1QpHab 5.8-12).⁵² It would not be unusual then for איש הכוזב to be the referent of רשע in 1QpHab 1.12-13; indeed such a reconstruction would display greater internal consistency than הכוהן הרשע. Not only is no further comment made upon ‘the Wicked Priest’ in 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a, but the sobriquet does not otherwise appear until column 8. This thesis is thus amenable to Lim’s reconstruction of איש הכוזב in 1QpHab 1.13.⁵³

A rather more dubious reconstruction is that of Brownlee who suggests that our sobriquet מטרי הכוזב should appear in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.11:

1.10. “Therefore the law is relaxed.”¹¹ [Its interpretation: ...] who rejected the law of God. (1QpHab 1.10-11)

Brownlee restores: ‘[Its prophetic meaning concerns מטרי הכוזב and the men of his congregation] who rejected the Law of God’ (1979, p.43; followed also by Wise *et al.* 2004a). He notes that in 1QpHab 5.8-12, ‘the Man of the Lie’ is accused of having ‘rejected the law’ (מאס את התורה; 1QpHab 5.11-12) and suggests that either מטרי הכוזב or איש הכוזב could therefore appropriately be reconstructed at 1QpHab 1.11 (Brownlee 1979, p.44). While he regards both sobriquets as identical in meaning, the preference given to מטרי הכוזב is puzzling. If either is to be reconstructed, איש הכוזב would appear the preferable choice given the parallel with 1QpHab 5.11-12 and employment of this sobriquet

⁵² Cf. also 4QpPs^a (4Q171) 4.13-16, to be examined below.

⁵³ So too Bernstein 2000b, pp.649-650.

immediately below (1QpHab 2.1-2; and 1.13?). The lack of indication that a sobriquet is even required however suggests that we should refrain from speculating further as to the restoration of this lacuna.⁵⁴

1QpHab 5.8-12

The following passage is another that we have already examined with regard to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’:

^{5.8}“Why do you stare, traitors {בוגדים}, and keep silent when ⁹a wicked one {רשע} swallows up one more righteous than he?” Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom {בית אבשלום} ¹⁰and the men of their council who kept silent at the rebuke of ¹¹מורה הצדק and did not help him against איש הכוזב – who rejected ¹²התורה in the midst of all their council. (1QpHab 5.8-12)

While מטיף הכוזב is again absent, the related sobriquet איש הכוזב is once more employed. As noted above, the sobriquet appears as the referent of רשע (‘a wicked one’), in contrast to מורה הצדק, the referent of צדיק. Such lends weight to Lim’s proposal that איש הכוזב should likewise be restored alongside מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 1.13 (2000a; 2002, pp.35-36).

A confrontation is here described at which ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ was seemingly rebuked (cf. n.13 above) while ‘the Man of the Lie’ is accused of having ‘rejected the law {מאס את התורה} in the midst of all their council’ (cf. 1QpHab 1.11). While this specific accusation is not made against איש הכוזב in the ESL, he is associated with those who ‘rejected {מאסו} the covenant and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus’ (CD 20.11-12; cf. 1QpHab 2.1-4) and by implication, as a rival pedagogic figure, accused of having rejected the ‘teacher’ (CD 1.10-18a; 20.10-15; cf. 1QpHab 2.1-4).⁵⁵ Given that the latter figure is presented as the divinely authorised teacher and exponent of the law (e.g. CD 1.10-11a; 20.27-34; 1QH^a 10.13-15a; 16.16-17), particularly in the

⁵⁴ See, for example, Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996.

⁵⁵ Cf. 1QH^a 10-12.

Pesher on Habakkuk itself (cf. 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a; 7.1 – 8.3a), rejection of both him and ‘the covenant’ could be construed by the sect as rejection of התורה of God (1QpHab 5.8-12; cf. 1.11).⁵⁶

‘The Man of the Lie’ (אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב) is thus presented at odds with ‘the Men of Truth’ (אֲנָשֵׁי הָאֱמֶת), not only with regard to the ideologically polarised labels employed but also since the latter are described as עוֹשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה (cf. 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a). ‘The Men of Truth’ are furthermore linked with ‘the House of Judah’ while ‘the Man of the Lie’ is associated in our present passage with ‘the House of Absalom’ (בֵּית אֲבִשָׁלוֹם; 1QpHab 5.9). This designation constitutes the referent of בּוֹגְדִים in the lemma and hence the association of אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב with ‘traitors’ is again affirmed. The label בֵּית אֲבִשָׁלוֹם itself has been variously interpreted, either in reference to a historical individual named Absalom (Driver 1965, pp.271-272; Freedman 1949; Vermes 2004, p.64) or as a type drawing upon the treachery and silence of Absalom in 2 Samuel 13-18 (Brownlee 1948, p.17, n.36; 1979, pp.91-95; Callaway 1988, pp.150-151; Schiffman 1994, p.119; Teicher 1954).⁵⁷ Of these, the latter opinion that it denoted “a type representing treacherous behaviour” (Bengtsson 2000a, pp.176-177) would appear most congruent with its employment in 1QpHab 5.8-12. The usage here of the label אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב, in association with this term, thus accords with what we find both in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document belonging to the ESL and 1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a.

⁵⁶ Bengtsson highlights the potential significance in this regard of Amos 2.4b: ‘because they have rejected the law of the LORD {עַל־מַאֲסָם אֶת־תּוֹרַת יְהוָה}, and have not kept his statutes, but they have been led astray by the same lies {וַיִּתְּעוּם כִּזְבֵּיהֶם} after which their ancestors walked.’ See Bengtsson 2000a, pp.100-101. We have already noted the particular association of the root תַּעַה with כֹּזֵב (and לִיץ) in Chapter Three (e.g. CD 1.10-18a; 1QH^a 10-12).

⁵⁷ See the excellent summary in Bengtsson 2000a, pp.165-178. Also, Nitzan 2000.

1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a

The final passage from 1QPesher on Habakkuk we shall examine with regard to the sobriquet **מטף הכזב** is 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a:

^{10.5}“Woe ⁶to him who builds {בונה} a city with bloodshed and founds a town on iniquity. Is it not ⁷from YHWH of hosts that peoples labour for fire ⁸and nations grow weary for nothing?” ⁹The interpretation of the word concerns **מטף הכזב**, who led many astray {התעה רבים} ¹⁰to build a city of vanity {לבנות עיר שווא} with bloodshed and to establish a congregation in falsehood {עדה בשקר}, ¹¹for its glory making many labour in the service of vanity {שווא} and teaching them ¹²wo[r]ks of falsehood {להרוחם במנע[ש]י שקר} so that their toil is for nothing and that they come ¹³to the judgements of fire those who reviled and reproached the elect of God {בחירי אל}. ¹⁴“For the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of YHWH, as the waters ¹⁵cover the sea.” The interpretation of the word [is that] ¹⁶when they return [... ¹⁷...] **הכזב**^{11.1}, and afterwards knowledge will be revealed to them like the waters of ²the sea in abundance. (1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a)

Of especial significance is, in 1QpHab 10.9, our first encounter with the ‘standard’ form, **מטף הכזב**. As with **מורה הצדק**, so here **מטף הכזב** bears great resemblance to an indefinite label attested in the ESL (**מטף כזב**; CD 8.13). While the latter seemingly performed a descriptive function however (cf. CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26), the definite article here suggests a titular role. Hence, while we translated **מטף כזב** ‘a spouter of a lie’, the definite sobriquet **מטף הכזב** should best be rendered ‘the Spouter of the Lie’.⁵⁸

Noting, as we did in Chapter Three, the dual meaning of **נמף**, indicative of ‘spouting’ / ‘dripping’ and likewise ‘preaching’ or the activity of (false?) prophets (cf. Micah 2.6-11), **מטף הכזב** has also been rendered by such terms as ‘the Oracle of Lies’ (Brownlee 1948), ‘the Prophet of Lies’ (Brownlee 1979) and ‘the Preacher of Lies’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Knibb 1994a).⁵⁹ This label thus stands in true antithesis to **מורה הצדק** (‘the Teacher of Righteousness’), both

⁵⁸ So too Horgan 2002. Similarly: ‘the Spouter of Lies’ (Vermes 2004); ‘the One who Spouts the Lie’ (Horgan 1979); ‘the Spreader of the Lie’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); ‘the Spreader of Lies’ (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a); ‘the Spreader of Deceit’ (García Martínez 1996).

⁵⁹ See Clines (ed.) 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

sobriquets functioning as an explicit evaluation of relative didactic roles and utilising terminology that betrays a metaphorical use of water imagery. As Brownlee comments:

since the Hebrew word *môreh* can mean “rain” as well as “teacher” and can even be rendered as a participle, “he who showers,” the two men may be contrasted as “he who drips lies” and “he who showers truth.” (Brownlee 1982, p.10)⁶⁰

It is conspicuous however that the sobriquet מורה הצדק is absent from this the only passage in 1QPesher on Habakkuk to contain מטף הכזב; what significance might this hold?

There are a number of thematic overlaps between this passage and those examined with regard to ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ in the FSL and ESL. For example, מטף הכזב is here accused of having ‘led many astray’ (התעה רבים) (1QpHab 10.9). This particular accusation was made also of ‘the Man of Scoffing’ who ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’ in CD 1.13-15:

^{1.13}That was the time about which it is written, “like a stray heifer, ¹⁴so Israel strayed”, when arose the Man of Scoffing who spouted to Israel ¹⁵waters of a lie {הטף לִישְׂרָאֵל} and led them astray {וַיַּתְעֵם} in a wilderness without a way (CD 1.13-15).⁶¹

Similarly in the Hodayot the opponents of the protagonist, identified with labels such as ‘mediators of a lie’ (מליצי כזב; 1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10) and ‘prophets of a lie’ (נביאי כזב; 1QH^a 12.16), alike in sense and terminology to מטף הכזב, are frequently described by use of the root תעה; e.g. מליצי תעות (1QH^a 10.14); נביאי כזב מפותי תעות (1QH^a 12.16); מליצי רמיה [ה]תעות (1QH^a 12.7); חוזי תעות (1QH^a 12.20).

Likewise מטף הכזב is accused of establishing ‘a congregation in falsehood’ (עדה בשקר; 1QpHab 10.10). In the ESL, the indefinite label מטף

⁶⁰ Cf. ‘the dripper of untruth’ (Rowley 1958, p.122).

⁶¹ ‘The Men of Scoffing’ in CD 20.10-12 are accused of דברו תועה על חקי הצדק (CD 20.11).

כֹּזֵב is similarly associated with a congregation (עֲדָתוֹ; CD 8.12-13; cf. 19.24b-26a), as is ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (עֲדָת בּוֹגְרִים; CD 1.11b-18a).⁶² The use of שִׁקְרָא, as well as reinforcing the theme of lies established by כֹּזֵב (cf. Micah 2.11), is reminiscent of those who ‘prophesied falsehood’ (יִנְבְּאוּ שִׁקְרָא; CD 6.1) encountered in the FSL.⁶³ We have speculated in previous chapters that CD 5.20 – 6.2a may have provided a typology for describing opposition to the יֹרֵה (CD 6.11a) in the sense of false teaching. While the accusation of such is implicit in the sobriquet מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב, in 1QpHab 10.11-12 it is explicitly stated that this figure is ‘teaching them wo[r]ks of falsehood’ (לְהַרְוֹתָם בְּמַעֲשֵׂי שִׁקְרָא).⁶⁴ Such action recalls CD 8.12-13 where we learn that:

a spouter of a lie spouted to them, against all of whose congregation the anger of God was kindled. (CD 8.13)

The presentation of מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב in 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a thus accords with that of מְטִיף כֹּזֵב in the ESL as a false teacher, in contrast to the true teacher.

The reference in the lemma to he ‘who builds a city with bloodshed’ (בּוֹנֵה עִיר בַּדָּמִים; 1QpHab 10.6) is interpreted in the pesher with regard to the

⁶² Note further, עֲדָת דּוֹרְשֵׁי חֻלְקוֹת (1QH^a 10.32); cf. CD 1.18 – 2.1.

⁶³ Cf. נְבִיא כֹזֵב in 1QH^a 12.16 (ESL). Note also that both יִנְבְּאוּ שִׁקְרָא (FSL) and נְבִיא כֹזֵב (ESL) are brought into association with the root הָעָה (CD 5.20 – 6.2a; 1QH^a 12.14b-16). Charlesworth highlights with regard to 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a that neither כֹּזֵב nor שִׁקְרָא are ‘echo words’; neither appear in the lemma (2002, pp.96-97).

⁶⁴ For discussion of the form לְהַרְוֹתָם, see Horgan 1979, pp.47-48. She derives it from the root רוּה and so renders ‘saturating them’ though admits the reading is uncertain (see too Brownlee 1979; Knibb 1994a; Horgan 2002); cf. הָרָה, ‘to conceive / be pregnant’ (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; Vermes 2004). For a derivation from יָרָה however, see: García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a (cf. Abegg, Bowley and Cook 2003; Kuhn (ed.) 1960; also, note 1QH^a 14.9-10). A reference to ‘teaching’ would be appropriate to the context and indeed Brownlee notes that even a derivation from רוּה should be interpreted as “a sarcastic and punning surrogate” of this activity: “*Rāwāh* means ‘to drench, to saturate, to water abundantly.’ It is thereby an apt figure of speech for instruction by the ‘Dripper of Lies.’ ... It is this which makes it more suitable to the context than simply ‘teach’” (1979, p.172).

efforts of **לְבַנוֹת עִיר** 'to build a city of vanity with bloodshed' (**מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב**; 1QpHab 10.10). The Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, in an effort to portray **כֹּזֵב מְטִיף** as a false prophet, draws upon Ezekiel 13 and so associates this figure with the 'builders of the wall' (**בּוֹנֵי הַחֵיץ**; CD 8.12; 19.24-25) and the 'daubers of whitewash' (**טָחִי (ה)חֶפֶל**; CD 8.12; 19.25).⁶⁵ A similar association between the 'builders of the wall' and 'a spouter' (**מְטִיף**) is to be found in CD 4.19-20. This may explain why **מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב** was employed in 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a and not **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב**, as attested in 1.10b – 2.10a and 5.8-12; the suitability of the former would have been suggested to the pesharist by the reference to building in the lemma (Habakkuk 2.12-13) given the specific association of this label with building activity in the ESL.⁶⁶ In this context it should also be noted that Habakkuk 2.12 is echoed in Micah 3.10:

בָּנָה עִיר בַּדְמִים וּבֹנֵן קְרִיָּה בַעוּלָה (Habakkuk 2.12)⁶⁷

בָּנָה צִיּוֹן בַּדְמִים וִירוּשָׁלַם בַּעוּלָה (Micah 3.10)

We have already highlighted the role of Micah 2.6-11 with regard to the pairing of **נֶטֶף** and **כֹּזֵב**, and further noted the reference to:

the prophets who lead my people astray {**הַנְּבִיאִים הַמַּחֲעִים אֶת־עַמִּי**}, who cry "Peace" (Micah 3.5).

This itself bears relation to Ezekiel 13.8-16 (esp. 13.10) and hence Habakkuk 2.12, Micah 2-3 and Ezekiel 13 might be construed as a web of texts that have

⁶⁵ **בּוֹנֵי הַחֵיץ** corrected from **בּוֹנֵי הַחוּץ** (CD 8.12; cf. 19.24-25), following Qimron 1992a and Schechter 1970.

⁶⁶ This may also explain why **הַכֹּזֵב הַרְשָׁע** is not employed despite the various references to this sobriquet surrounding the passage (cf. 1QpHab 8.3 – 9.12a; 11.2 – 12.10). See Grossman 2002, p.156.

⁶⁷ Cf. **בָּנָה עִיר בַּדְמִים וִיכֹנֵן קְרִיָּה בַעוּלָה** (1QpHab 10.6).

bearing (perhaps via CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a) upon the pesher concerning מט"ף הכזב (1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a).⁶⁸

It is not clear whether the building activity attributed to מט"ף הכזב is to be taken literally or metaphorically (cf. Burrows 1956, p.153; Cross 1995, p.117). That לקים עדה בשקר is interpreted in reference to יכונן קריה בעולה (1QpHab 10.6, 10) may suggest a similarly metaphorical understanding of לבנות (so Knibb 1994a, p.243).

It may be that the city imagery is not meant literally, but refers to construction of a community. (VanderKam and Flint 2002, p.288)⁶⁹

Brownlee on the other hand argues that this comparison indicates “two types of building”, the physical (ע"ר שון) and the spiritual (עדה בשקר), the former referring to Jerusalem.⁷⁰ Of course, it may be that an association of the ‘spouter’ with metaphorical building activity in CD 4.19-20, 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a (dependent upon the depiction of false prophets in Ezekiel 13) had, by the LSL, become entrenched and understood in a literal sense.

The qualification of the city as ‘vanity’ (שון; 1QpHab 10.10) and the reference to ‘the service of vanity’ (עבודת שון; 10.11) are perhaps to be read in the light of CD 4.19-20 concerning ‘the builders of the wall who walked after צו’. We noted in Chapter Three that the phrase הלכו אחרי צו (CD 4.19)

⁶⁸ Noted also in Cross 1995, pp.116-117.

⁶⁹ So too VanderKam 2003, pp.473-474. Cf. 4Q171 (4QpPs*) 3.14-19, where בנה is used metaphorically in reference to עדה (to be examined below). Hugh Schonfield suggests that the language indicates merely “an edifice of lies built up by the Prophet of Untruth” (1956, p.101). The following observation, drawing upon Philo of Alexandria’s *De Decalogo* and the question as to “why God gave the law to Israel in the desert”, may perhaps be of significance: “The law is the foundation of a new, pure city. As such, it must be given precisely in the desert, not in the city” (Najman 2006, p.107). Might such lend weight to a metaphorical understanding of the ‘city of vanity’ established by מט"ף הכזב, perhaps in terms of a rival interpretation of the law? Such would indeed be congruent with the context of false teaching in which מט"ף הכזב is consistently depicted.

⁷⁰ Brownlee 1982, p.14 (cf. 1979, pp.169-170). He thus concludes that מט"ף הכזב was “a chief priest” (1979, p.44), to be identified specifically with Hyrcanus I (1952; 1979; 1982).

echoes **אחר־צו** הלך from Hosea 5.11 where **צו** is rendered ‘vanity’ by the *NRSV*, taking it as **שוא** following the Septuagint.⁷¹ It is perhaps significant that **עיר שו** is paralleled by **עדה בשקר** (1QpHab 10.10), while **עבודת שו** is paired with **מנע[ע] שקר** (1QpHab 10.11-12). Brownlee accordingly highlights that **שו** is to be regarded a synonym of **שקר** and taken as a qualification of **מטיף הכוזב** (1979, p.169). In this context it is interesting to note that the Yahadic redaction of CD 4.19-20 states:

the **צו** is a spouter {מטיף} of whom he said “they shall surely spout {הטף יטיפון}”
(CD 4.19-20)

Indeed Ezekiel 13, concerning the ‘builders of the wall’, repeatedly attests **שוא** seemingly in the sense of ‘falsehood’; for example, **חזו שוא וקסם כזב** which the *NRSV* renders: ‘They have prophesied falsehood and lying divination’ (Ezekiel 13.6; cf. 13.6-9). The appropriateness of this language with regard to the pesher on Habakkuk 2.12, and in relation to **מטיף הכוזב** in particular, is apparent.

Most of line 16 and all of line 17 are missing from column 10 of 1QpHab, though significantly **הכוזב** appears as the first word of column 11 suggesting that it was immediately preceded by either **מטיף** (Eisenman 1996, pp.405-421; Horgan 1979; 2002; Knibb 1994a; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or **איש** (Brownlee 1948; 1979). That **מטיף הכוזב** appears as the subject of the previous lemma suggests that we should most likely restore the same here.⁷² Hence 1QpHab 10.17 – 11.1 may witness a second attestation of **מטיף הכוזב**.

The various thematic overlaps we have seen (e.g. false teaching; leading astray; building activity) and the use of identical terminology (e.g. **עדה**; **תעה**;

⁷¹ Cf. Campbell 1995a, pp.116-131; R.T. White 1990, p.82. See Holladay 2000; Koehler and Baumgartner 1996; 1999.

⁷² So too Bengtsson 2000a, p.88, n.1.

מַטִּיף; not to mention the sobriquet itself) indicate that the presentation of מַטִּיף in 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a is remarkably congruent with that of the ‘spouter’ in the ESL (cf. CD 1.10-18a; 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a). Perhaps, as with מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק, the evidence of some continuity between the ESL and LSL may lead us to observe the same phenomenon that the indefinite description ‘a spouter of a lie’ (מַטִּיף כֹּזֵב), by the acquisition of the definite article, has become in the LSL the seemingly appellative form ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (הַמַּטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב).

Summary

The sobriquet מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב is certainly attested at least once in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (10.9) and most probably appeared also in 1QpHab 10.17 – 11.1. The assertion by Brownlee (1979, p.43; followed also by Wise *et al.* 2004a) that we should restore מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.11 seems unlikely however. One further place in which we might have *expected* to find מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב is the pesher to Habakkuk 2.18 which, in the MT, refers to ‘a teacher of falsehood’ (מוֹרֵה שֶׁקֶר; cf. Isaiah 9.14). However, when cited in 1QpHab 12.10-12, the form attested is מַרִּי שֶׁקֶר:

^{12.10}“What use is an idol once its maker has shaped it, ¹¹a cast image and fatling of falsehood {מַרִּי שֶׁקֶר}? For its maker trusts in what he has made, ¹²making dumb idols.” The interpretation of the word concerns all ¹³the idols of the nations which they have made to serve them and bow down ¹⁴to them, but they will not deliver them on the day of judgement. (1QpHab 12.10-14)

The fact that מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב is absent from the pesher implies that מַרִּי שֶׁקֶר is not simply a scribal error but was the understood reading, and similarly militates against viewing מַרִּי as a variant form of מוֹרֵה.⁷³ It is rendered here a ‘fatling of

⁷³ Cf. Lim 2000a, pp.47-48; Rabin 1955, pp.153-154.

falsehood' following Brownlee (1979) and Knibb (1994a; cf. Vermes 2004: 'fatling of lies').⁷⁴

In addition to 'the Spouter of the Lie', 1QPesher on Habakkuk also refers to 'the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 1.1-2; 5.11) utilising the same form, אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב, found in the ESL (CD 20.15). How should we regard these two sobriquets in relation to each other? In the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document we noted that מַטְיָה הַכֹּזֵב appeared to function as a description of the figure labelled 'the Man of Scoffing' (cf. CD 1.13-15) who in turn appeared to be identical to 'the Man of the Lie' (cf. CD 20.10-15).⁷⁵ Accordingly we could consider מַטְיָה הַכֹּזֵב and אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב to have the same frame of reference in the Pesher on Habakkuk, being synonymous titles for one figure.⁷⁶ Brownlee argues this position on terminological grounds:

The latter term [מַטְיָה הַכֹּזֵב] may also be translated Prophet of Lies or False Prophet, since the verb lying behind "dripper" is used in Scripture for the "distilling" of prophetic speech, as in Deut. 32:2. "Man of Lies" parodies the Old Testament title "man of God" for a prophet. Thus most probably both terms are synonyms for the same person. (Brownlee 1982, pp.9-10)

Charlesworth suggests that likewise:

The Man of the Lie seems to perform *the same functions* as the Spouter of the Lie. The similar opposition to the Righteous Teacher and the similarity of the sobriquets suggest that these virtually identical terms refer to the same distinct person. (Charlesworth 2002, p.96; my italics)

However, is this really the case? 'The Spouter of the Lie' is not set opposite 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in 1QpHab10.5b – 11.2a (though the emphasis on false teaching may betray an implied ideological opposition), while both attestations of 'the Man of the Lie' are in the immediate context of this figure

⁷⁴ Reading מַרְאֵה as מַרְאֵה. Horgan (1979; 2002) and Rabin (1955, pp.153-154) opt to read מַרְאֵה, 'vision' or 'image' (cf. LXX). Further possibilities are listed in Horgan 1979 (p.54) and Lim 2000a (p.48, n.9).

⁷⁵ See the relevant discussion in Chapter Three.

⁷⁶ So for example the recent studies of the pesharim by Charlesworth (2002, pp.94-97) and Lim (2002, pp.72-74).

(1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a; 5.8-12). Similarly, in agreement with the portrayal of the ‘spouter’ in the ESL, ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ is associated with ‘leading astray’ (העדה), a congregation (עדה), falsehood (שקר) and building (בנה). These are not used of ‘the Man of the Lie’ who is instead associated with traitors (בוגדים), the wicked (רשע), rejection of the law (מאס את התורה) and of both the covenant and ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (1QpHab 2.1-4; 5.8-12; cf. CD 20.10-15). Thus both sobriquets come with their own individual connotations and associated terminology (perhaps drawn from the ESL). This may explain why the reference to building in Habakkuk 2.12 prompted the use of מטיף הכוזב in the pesher rather than איש הכוזב as previously employed. While the two sobriquets מטיף הכוזב and איש הכוזב may well have been *understood* in reference to the same figure, it appears evident that (*contra* Charlesworth) in the Pesher on Habakkuk they performed a distinct function as labels.

Excursus: ‘The Wicked Priest’

We have observed above that a further sobriquet to be found in 1QPesher on Habakkuk is הכוהן הרשע, ‘the Wicked Priest’. It appears five times altogether, twice in 1QpHab 8.3 – 9.12a (8.8; 9.9) and three times in 1QpHab 11.2 – 12.10 (11.4; 12.2, 8).⁷⁷ There are also, in close proximity to the appearances of this label, three occurrences of simply הכוהן that would appear to correspond to the sobriquet (8.16; 9.16; 11.12) and a reference to כוהני ירושלם האחרונים, ‘the last priests of Jerusalem’ (9.4-5).⁷⁸ A number of scholars have suggested that ‘the Wicked Priest’ should be regarded as synonymous with ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ and ‘the Man of the Lie’ (e.g. Brownlee 1952; 1982; Cross 1995, pp.116-117; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Thiering

⁷⁷ There is, as noted, some dispute as to whether the title should also be reconstructed in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.13 (see n.51 above; cf. Lim 2000a; 2002, pp.35-36).

⁷⁸ Seemingly distinct from the *positive* use of הכוהן in 1QpHab 2.8, which would appear to indicate מורה הצדק (see n.10 above). Lim tentatively suggests that [מטיף] (sic) should be restored instead at 1QpHab 9.16 (1993a, p.422).

1978; Vermes 1981; 2004, pp.54-66). Therefore we shall briefly examine the specific employment of **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע** in 1QpHab 8.3 – 9.12a and 11.2 – 12.10 in order to assess this claim:

^{8.3}“And moreover wealth will betray the arrogant man and not ⁴will he last, he who widens his throat like Sheol, and he, like death, cannot be satisfied. ⁵And all the nations are gathered to him and all the peoples are assembled to him. ⁶Will they not all of them raise a taunt against him and be mediators of riddles about him, ⁷and say, ‘Woe to he who multiplies what is not his, how long will he burden himself with ⁸debt?’” Its interpretation concerns **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע** who ⁹was called by the name of truth when he first arose, but when he ruled ¹⁰over Israel his heart became proud and he abandoned God and betrayed the decrees for the sake of ¹¹wealth. And he stole and gathered the wealth of men of violence who had rebelled against God. ¹²And he took the wealth of the peoples, adding upon himself guilty sin, and ways of ¹³abomination he followed in every unclean impurity. “Will not they suddenly arise, ¹⁴your creditors, and those who make you tremble awake, and you will be their booty? ¹⁵For you have plundered many nations, but all the rest of the peoples will plunder you.” ¹⁶The int[erpretation of the word] concerns **הַכֹּהֵן** who rebelled ¹⁷[...] the decrees of [...] ...[...]. ^{9.1}afflicting him with the judgements of wickedness and horrors of ²evil diseases worked upon him, and vengeance on his body of flesh. And when ³it says, “For you have plundered many nations, but all ⁴the rest of the peoples will plunder you”, its interpretation concerns the last priests of Jerusalem ⁵who will gather wealth and profit from plundering the peoples. ⁶But at the end of days their wealth will be given, with their plunder, into the hand of ⁷the army of the Kittim. For they are ‘the rest of the peoples’. ⁸“Because of human bloodshed and violence to the land, the town and all ^{who dwell} in it.” ⁹Its interpretation concerns **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע** whom, because of wrong done to **הַצֶּדֶק** ¹⁰**מִוְרָה** and the men of his council, God gave into the hand of his enemies to humble him ¹¹with disease, to destroy him in bitterness of soul because he had done wickedly ¹²against his elect. (1QpHab 8.3 – 9.12a)

^{11.2}“Woe to him who makes his neighbour drink, pouring out ³his anger, making him drunk so as to look upon their festivals.” ⁴Its interpretation concerns **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע**, who ⁵pursued **הַצֶּדֶק** ⁶**מִוְרָה**, to swallow him up in the heat of ⁶his anger, to the house of his exile. And at the time of the festival, the rest of ⁷the Day of Atonement, he appeared to them to swallow them up ⁸and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, the sabbath of their rest. “You are sated ⁹with shame rather than glory. Drink also yourself and stagger. ¹⁰It will turn against you, the cup of the right-hand of YHWH, and shame come ¹¹upon your glory.” ¹²Its interpretation concerns **הַכֹּהֵן** whose shame was greater than his glory, ¹³for he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart and walked in ways of ¹⁴drunkenness in order to quench his thirst, but the cup of the anger of ¹⁵[Go]d will swallow him up, adding [...] his [s]h[am]e and the pain ¹⁶[...]. ¹⁷“For the violence of Lebanon will cover you and the destruction of the animals] ^{12.1}will terrify you, because of human bloodshed and violence to the land, the town and all who dwell in it.” ²The interpretation of the word concerns **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע**, to pay him ³his reward for that which he did to the poor. For ‘Lebanon’ is ⁴the council of the Community (**עֲצַת הַיְּחָד**) and ‘the animals’ are the simple ones of Judah, ⁵**הַתֹּרֶה**. God will condemn him to destruction – ⁶just as he planned to destroy the poor. And when it says, “Because of the bloodshed of ⁷the town and violence to the land”, its interpretation: ‘the town’ is Jerusalem ⁸in which **הַכֹּהֵן הַרָשָׁע** performed works of abomination and defiled ⁹the sanctuary of God. And the

‘violence to the land’ are the cities of Judah where ¹⁰he stole the wealth of the poor. (1QpHab 11.2 – 12.10)

On the one hand, ‘the Wicked Priest’ is depicted in direct opposition to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (1QpHab 9.8-12a; 11.2-8), as is ‘the Man of the Lie’ (1QpHab 2.1-4; 5.8-12).⁷⁹ The above passages also surround that concerning ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a), raising the possibility that the same figure is here referred to (though cf. Bengtsson 2000a, p.53). Furthermore, we noted above the apparent dependence of 1QpHab 11.2-8 (LSL) upon 1QH^a 12.8-12 (ESL), and in particular the fact that **הכוהן הרשע** is employed in the pesher while we might have expected **מטיף הכזב** or **איש הכזב** since **מל יצי כזב** and **רמיה חוזי רמיה** appear in the Hodayot (see n.37 above; cf. Davies 1987, pp.96-97). While this may imply the “possession of genuine historical information” (Davies 1987, p.97), it may also suggest:

the possibility that the writer is not aware of any historical differentiation between the characters (Davies 1987, p.97)

Thus, **מטיף הכזב**, **איש הכזב** and **הכוהן הרשע** are perhaps to be regarded as interchangeable.

However, as with **מטיף הכזב** and **איש הכזב**, there are some unique features with regard to the specific employment of **הכוהן הרשע** and the terminology associated with it. First and foremost the sobriquet itself lays claim to a priestly role, something not associated with **מטיף הכזב** or **איש הכזב**, and the qualification of this is **רשע** rather than **כזב**.⁸⁰ ‘The Wicked Priest’ is further described as having ‘ruled over Israel’ (**משל בישראל**; 1QpHab 8.9-10) and ‘performed works of abomination and defiled the sanctuary of God’ (1QpHab

⁷⁹ Cf. 1QpHab 1.13; **הכוהן הרשע** or **איש הכזב**? The latter figure is moreover the referent of **רשע** in 1QpHab 5.8-12, thus both labels are associated with wickedness (see Lim 1997, p.99, n.5).

⁸⁰ Note however that **איש הכזב** is the referent of **רשע** in 1QpHab 5.8-12 (and 1.13?).

12.8-9), and is associated with the accumulation of wealth (הון), drunkenness (רוה) and Jerusalem (ירושלם). These are not used to describe מטיף הכזב or איש הכזב.⁸¹ He is also accused of attempting to ‘swallow up’ (בלע) ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ and ‘destroy the poor’ (כלות אביונים). More notable still are the vivid, and varied, accounts of the punishments that have been/will be received by ‘the Wicked Priest’.⁸²

It is significant that most of these elements are suggested by the lemma. That there are no apparent preconceived connotations of הכוהן הרשע may result from the absence of this sobriquet in earlier textual layers. Indeed the role of הכוהן attributed to this figure and the accusation that he ‘defiled the sanctuary’ are the only elements that cannot be straightforwardly derived from the lemma.⁸³ Even the presence of punishments, acted out or threatened, is suggested by the ‘woes’ of Habakkuk 2.5-20.⁸⁴ Thus little of the terminology used of ‘the Wicked Priest’ is independent of the lemma, while *none* of that regularly associated with either מטיף הכזב or איש הכזב (for example: תעה, חטא, שקר, בנה, בוגדים) is employed.⁸⁵ Our inference must be that, while it is

⁸¹ Unless the ‘city of vanity’ of 1QpHab 10.10 is to be taken literally and מטיף הכזב accordingly to be associated with Jerusalem (so Brownlee 1979, pp.169-170; 1982, p.14; see n.70 above).

⁸² It is these which have primarily led to the suggestion that the sobriquet may have been used of multiple ‘wicked priests’ (cf. Brownlee 1952; 1982; García Martínez and van der Woude 1990; Lim 1993a; van der Woude 1982).

⁸³ We have already noted the probable dependence of בלע upon either Habakkuk 1.13 (cf. 1QpHab 5.8-9) or the schemes of ‘Belial’ (בל יעל) in 1QH^a 12.10 (see n.36 above). Similarly הון is suggested by Habakkuk 2.5-6 (cf. 1QpHab 8.3-8), רוה by Habakkuk 2.15-16 (cf. 1QpHab 11.2-3, 8-11) and משל by Habakkuk 2.6 (cf. 1QpHab 8.6-8; see Bengtsson 2000b, pp.252-253; Brownlee 1979, pp.131-144). It is perhaps also of significance that the three nets of Belial in CD 4.14b-18 (introduced by פשרו) are ‘fornication’, ‘wealth’ and ‘defilement of the sanctuary’; by implication הכוהן הרשע is caught in at least two of these (cf. Kosmala 1978b). 1QpHab 12.6-10 may thus draw upon the phraseology of CD 4.14b – 5.16. For an overview of scriptural dependence and exegetical technique in the Peshier on Habakkuk, see Brooke 1994a.

⁸⁴ So too the ‘judgements of fire’ in the passage concerning ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a).

⁸⁵ Note however יבגוד בחוקים in 1QpHab 8.10.

possible that **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** and **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב**, **הַכֹּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע** were interchangeable, this is even less plausible than the argument that **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** and **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** were understood to be synonymous, as the ‘liar’ and ‘priest’ labels “have different spheres of action and characterization” (Dimant 1984, p.543, n.283).⁸⁶ In either case, the specific context and use (and absence) of terminology suggests that **הַכֹּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע** likewise fulfilled a *distinct* function as a label in 1QPesher on Habakkuk.

4.2.1.3. Sobriquets in 1QPesher on Habakkuk

For the first time in the course of our examination we have a text that attests the ‘standard’ forms **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** and **מֹרֶה הַצָּדֵק**, used so frequently in the secondary literature. Both bear great resemblance to the indefinite forms already seen in the ESL (**מַטִּיף כֹּזֵב** and **מֹרֶה צָדֵק**) and the contextual and terminological presentation of these ESL descriptions is likewise echoed in 1QPesher on Habakkuk. There is accordingly a sense of continuity with regard to the understanding and employment of these labels. That both are to be found with the definite article (and performing a seemingly titular function) in this text, suggests that some developmental process is at work.

It is equally significant that the titles ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (**מֹרֶה / יֹרֶה הַיְחִיד**) and ‘the Man of Scoffing’ (**אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן**), used in conjunction with the *descriptions* **מַטִּיף כֹּזֵב** and **מֹרֶה צָדֵק** respectively in the ESL, are absent from 1QPesher on Habakkuk. However, ‘the Man of the Lie’ (**אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב**), which we suggested may be synonymous with ‘the Man of Scoffing’ in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, is present in the Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 1.10b – 2.10a; 5.8-12). We must thus question the degree to which **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** can be regarded as synonymous with **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** in this text. We noted above that while the two labels share some terminological and

⁸⁶ See too the detailed studies by Gert Jeremias (1963) and Hartmut Stegemann (1971), unavailable to me at the time of writing. Cf. Callaway 1988 (esp. p.153); Charlesworth 2002; Lim 2002, pp.64-80.

contextual similarities, there are also numerous distinctions. These draw primarily upon connotations derived from the employment of these designations in the ESL and provide the impetus for the use of both **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** at 1QpHab 2.1-2 and 5.11 (in the context of **בִּגְדִים**) and **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** at 1QpHab 10.9 (and 10.17 – 11.1?; in the context of **בְּנֵה**). We must conclude therefore that while the two may have been *understood* as interchangeable designations for the same historical (?) referent (certainly perhaps by later readers), the very specificities of their respective employment demonstrate that the pesharist was aware of the distinct connotations associated with each. Thus on the *textual* level with which we are concerned, these labels cannot straightforwardly be regarded as synonymous.⁸⁷

A further sobriquet of some significance, **הַכֹּוֹהֵן הַרָשָׁע**, is also to be found in 1QPesher on Habakkuk. It differs in form from **מַטִּיף**, **מֹרֶה הַצַּדִּיק** and **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** (consisting as it does of a definite noun followed by a definite adjective) and has no discernible antecedent in the FSL or ESL (unless we should recognise in the opposition of this label to **מֹרֶה הַצַּדִּיק** the dichotomy between **צַדִּיק** and **רָשָׁע** prevalent in scripture and mediated likewise through the Hodayot; e.g. 1QH^a 7.17b-22a).⁸⁸ In the excursus above we noted both the points of similarity *and* those of difference between this sobriquet and **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** and **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב**. Similar observations lead Lim to conclude that:

If the wicked priest and liar are separate individuals, then it has to be said that the Habakkuk pesharist does not always maintain this distinction. (Lim 2000a, p.51)

Our conclusion with regard to **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** and **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** still stands here. The similarities between the employment of these three labels *allow* them to be read

⁸⁷ Such forces us to perhaps re-question also the relationship between **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** and **אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן** in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document. This may prove a fruitful avenue for further investigation.

⁸⁸ On the juxtaposition of **צַדִּיק** and **רָשָׁע**, see Kim 1985 (pp.153-191) and our discussion in Chapter Three. Cf. 1QH^a 4.20-21; 5.25-27; 6.9-10, 14-16; 7.17b-20; 10.12-13; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13.

as interchangeable.⁸⁹ However the points of difference indicate the undoubtedly distinct function of each on a literary level. The pesharist may have had no idea (or interest in?) how these sobriquets related to historical individuals (cf. Davies 1987, p.97). The labels in 1QPesher on Habakkuk must be seen primarily as literary devices, governed by the lemma, thus perhaps undermining their potential value as sources of historical information. Nevertheless, of equal value is the wealth of information they can provide with regard to the use and development of sobriquets within the sectarian material.

4.2.2. 1QPesher on Micah

4.2.2.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'

1Q14 frags 8-10, 1b-9a

The Pesher on Micah from Cave 1 contains one passage that makes apparent reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

Frgs 8-10, 1¹“For the transgression ²[of Jacob is all of this and for the sins of the House of Israel. What is the transgression of Ja]cob? Is it not ³[Samaria? And what are the high places of Judah? Is it not Je]rusa[lem? I will make Samaria ⁴a ruin of the country, a plantation of vines.”] Its interpretation concerns ⁵מטִיף הכֹּזֵב [who has led astray the] simple ones. “And what are the high places of Judah? ⁶[Is it not Jerusalem?” Its interpretation con]cerns מורה הצדק who himself ⁷[teaches {יורה} to] his [council] and to a[l] those volunteering to be added to the elect of ⁸[God {אל}], [בחירי אל], עושי התורה in the council of the Community {עצת היחד} who will be delivered from the day ⁹[of judgement ...]. (1Q14 frags 8-10, 1b-9a)⁹⁰

In the preliminary publication and subsequently in DJD 1, Josef Milik read מורי הצדק in line 6 and suggested that “on y pourrait voir l'intensification du nom du Maître, par le pluriel” (Milik 1952, p.415; cf. 1955). Theodor Gaster (1957) rendered the designation 'those who expound the Law correctly', adopting

⁸⁹ Indeed the use of stereotypical language allows them to be interpreted in reference not just to the *same* historical individual but to a plurality of (distinct?) figures. Modern evidence of this comes from a cursory overview of the various hypotheses that have been advanced attempting to identify the referent(s) of these sobriquets (see Chapter One; also VanderKam 1999a).

⁹⁰ Following the structural reconstruction of Milik (1952; 1955; followed also by García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004; Wise *et al.* 2004b). Note however the alternative structure suggested by Horgan (1979, esp. pp.55-56; 2002).

an explicitly plural understanding of the form. The use of the singular pronoun immediately after, however, militates against this approach. It has been suggested that מורי הצדק might represent an “orthographic variant” (Bengtsson 2000a, p.212) or even “phonetic spelling” (Brownlee 1979, p.47) of מורה הצדק, and should thus be translated in the usual fashion. Indeed, Horgan has argued that “*mwry* is not a good reading” and that:

the traces that are visible on the photograph do not entirely exclude the usual spelling *mwrh*. The word is vertically aligned with other words that are partially obscured by some damage to the skin; ... Thus, I transcribe *mw[r]h*. (Horgan 1979, p.60)

The reading מורה has also been explicitly adopted by Bengtsson (2000a) and in the *DSSSE* of García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997).⁹¹ In light of the doubt expressed above with regard to the implied meaning of מורי הצדק, and given that מורה הצדק (already noted on six occasions in 1QpHab) remains a viable transcription, the latter reading is to be preferred here.⁹²

The ‘high places of Judah’ (Micah 1.5), identified with Jerusalem, are here interpreted in reference to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (1Q14 frags 8-10, 5-6). Either that or ‘the high places’ should be understood as ‘the council of the Community’ (עצת היחד; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 8) and ‘Judah’ as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (so Brownlee 1979, pp.203-204; cf. Brooke 1994a, p.347). The presence of עצת היחד is significant given that, in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, the ‘teacher’ is associated with ‘the Men of the Community’ (אנשי היחיד; CD 20.32) and himself titled ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (מורה / יורה היחיד; CD 20.1; 20.14).⁹³ Furthermore, 1QpHab

⁹¹ See in addition the PTSDSSP (Horgan 2002). Note that García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) also reconstruct מורה הצדק in the lacuna at frag.11, 4, though no traces remain in the text and so accordingly this is far from certain.

⁹² In either case, the sense מורה הצדק would appear to be assured.

⁹³ Note also the association of the protagonist of the Hodayot with יחד (e.g. 1QH^a 12.23b-25a; cf. Chapter Three, n.118). Cf. אנשי היחד in 4Q252 5.5.

9.8-12a refers to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council’ (מורה הצדק ואנשי עצתו; 1QpHab 9.9-10) and describes them moreover as ‘his (God’s) elect’ (בחירו; 1QpHab 9.12). Similarly in our present passage ‘the council of the Community’ are described as ‘the elect of [God (?)]’ (בחירי [אל]); 1Q14 frags 8-10, 7-8; cf. 1QpHab 10.13), once more recalling צדק בחירי of 1QH^a 10.13.

Other phrases, found in the reconstructed portions of the passage, are likewise reminiscent of descriptions of מורה הצדק elsewhere. For example, Milik suggests עושי התורה should be read in the lacuna at line 8, perhaps on account of the reference to delivery ‘from the day [of judgement]’ (1Q14 frags 8-10, 8-9; cf. 1QpHab 8.1-3) and ‘[the] simple ones’ (1Q14 frags 8-10, 5; cf. 1QpHab 12.4-5).⁹⁴ He also offers יורה התורה in line 7 with regard to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’, followed by García Martínez (1996), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Vermes (2004).⁹⁵ Both suggestions are feasible and fit with the context of the passage. Neither is certain, though, owing to the terminological overlaps with 1QPesher on Habakkuk, the presence of עושי התורה in line 8 is perhaps the likelier of the two.

4.2.2.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’

1Q14 frags 8-10, 1b-9a

The same passage from 1QPesher on Micah may also, it has been argued, attest ‘the Spouter of the Lie’:

Frgs 8-10, 1^a “For the transgression ²[of Jacob is all of this and for the sins of the House of Israel. What is the transgression of Ja]cob? Is it not ³[Samaria? And what are the high places of Judah? Is it not Je]rusa[lem? I will make Samaria ⁴a ruin of the country, a plantation of vines.”] Its interpretation concerns מטיף הכזב ⁵[who has led astray {יחעה} the] simple ones. “And what are the high places of Judah? ⁶[Is it not Jerusalem?” Its interpretation con]cerns מורה הצדק who himself ⁷[teaches התורה to]

⁹⁴ See Milik 1952 and 1955; followed by: García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Gaster 1957; Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; cf. Wise *et al.* 2004b.

⁹⁵ Cf. Wise *et al.* 2004b.

his [council] and to a[l] those volunteering to be added to the elect of ⁸[God, עושי] in the council of the Community who will be delivered from the day ⁹[of judgement ...]. (1Q14 frags 8-10, 1b-9a)

In the preliminary publication Milik read מַטִּיף כּוֹז (1952) in line 4, though later amended this reading to מַטִּיף הַכּוֹז in the *editio princeps* (1955), noting that כּ and ה were uncertain. This has been rejected by Carmignac (1962a, p.516) and Horgan (1979, p.60; 2002), though no alternative restoration is proffered. The reading מַטִּיף הַכּוֹז has the support however of Bengtsson (2000a, pp.105-106), Burrows (1958, p.404), Dupont-Sommer (1961, p.278), García Martínez (1996), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997), Gaster (1957), Lim (2002, p.73) and Vermes (2004).⁹⁶

This form, if accepted, is identical to that attested in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 10.9) and the addition of the definite article alone distinguishes it from the indefinite description מַטִּיף כּוֹז found in the ESL (e.g. CD 8.13). It is hardly surprising that some form of the sobriquet מַטִּיף הַכּוֹז is to be found in the Pesher on Micah since we have already noted in Chapter Three that the origin of the designation is likely to be Micah 2.11. Indeed it is interesting to speculate as to what the specific pesher on Micah 2.11 might have been (only the interpretations of Micah 1.2-9 and 6.15-16 have survived in 1Q14; cf. Micah 4.8-12 in 4Q168 [4QpMic?]); if such existed we would surely expect to find some reference to the false preaching of מַטִּיף הַכּוֹז.⁹⁷

It would appear that ‘the transgression of Jacob’, identified with Samaria (Micah 1.5-6), is here interpreted in reference to ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (1Q14 frags 8-10, 1-5). A dichotomy is thus established between Jacob/Samaria(/Israel) and Judah/Jerusalem in the lemma, and between ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ and ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ in the pesher (cf. Brownlee 1979, pp.203-204). The

⁹⁶ Note also Wise *et al.* 2004b.

⁹⁷ In similar fashion we might bemoan the fact that no pesher has survived on Hosea 10.12, a passage that we have argued influenced the expectation of יוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק in CD 6.11a (cf. 4Q166 [4QpHos^a] and 4Q167 [4QpHos^b]).

reference in the lemma to ‘the sins of the House of Israel’ (Micah 1.5), seemingly associated in the pesher with those led astray by ‘the Spouter of the Lie’, recalls the positive reference to ‘עושי התורה’ in the House of Judah’ who were loyal to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (1QpHab 8.1-3). It is notable however that ‘[the] simple ones’ (ה[פ]תאים); 1Q14 frags 8-10, 5) are in our present text likely “the object of Jacob’s transgression” (Brooke 1994a, p.347) while in 1QpHab we find reference to יהודה עושה התורה (1QpHab 12.4-5).⁹⁸ The opposition of ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ to ‘the elect of God’ (בחירי אל; 1QpHab 10.13) in the Pesher on Habakkuk (10.5b – 11.2a) is also significant given that in 1Q14 frags 8-10, 7-8 we have ‘the elect of [...]’. At this point Milik proposes to reconstruct [אל] בחירי.⁹⁹ He also inserts יתעה in the lacuna at line 5; such would be in keeping with the terminology used of the ‘spouter’ elsewhere (e.g. CD 1.13-15; 1QpHab 10.9; cf. 1QH^a 10.14, 31; 12.7, 9-10, 16, 20) but cannot be made certain.

4.2.2.3. Sobriquets in 1QPesher on Micah

In spite of some disagreement among scholars, 1QPesher on Micah would appear to attest both מורה הצדק (frags 8-10, 6) and מטיף הכוזב (frags 8-10, 4) in the same form as found in the Pesher on Habakkuk. In addition, the terminology associated with each is congruent with that used of these figures elsewhere (e.g. בחר; עצה; יחד; תעה [?]). It would seem logical to conclude therefore that the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכוזב are used here with the same frame of reference as in 1QpHab and, as there, we can note that the indefinite descriptions מורה צדק and מטיף כוזב of the ESL have seemingly been supplanted in the LSL by titles referring to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ and ‘the Spouter of the Lie’.

⁹⁸ The form עושה התורה, rather than עושי התורה, in 1QpHab 12.4-5 prompts Brownlee to translate ‘the simple of Judah the Law Doer’ and, drawing also upon the interpretation of ‘Judah’ in 1Q14, posit accordingly that we may here be able to identify ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (1979, pp.202-205). Cf. Brooke 1994a, pp.346-347.

⁹⁹ Followed by: García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; cf. Wise *et al.* 2004b.

4.2.3. 4QPesher on Isaiah^c

4.2.3.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'

4Q163 frag.21, 1-6

Six pesher texts on Isaiah are to be found among the sectarian literature of the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls, one from Cave 3 (3Q4) and five from Cave 4 (4Q161-165). One of the latter, written on papyrus (4Q163 [4Qpap pIsa^c]), may contain reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

Frag.21. 1^a“Shall [not, in a very little while, it return again, 2^aLebanon, to an orchard, as a wood it will be] reckoned?” The 'Le[b]anon' a[re 3^a...] to an orchard and they will return [... 4^a...] by the sword. And when [it says ... 5^a...] ... [... 6^a...] ... [...] מורה [...]. (4Q163 frag.21, 1-6)

This passage is highly fragmentary and the lemma would appear to be from Isaiah 29.17 (so Allegro 1968; Allegro *et al.* 2004a; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).¹⁰⁰ The pesher is likewise hard to decipher though line 6 attests [...]. מורה. This has been translated 'the Teacher' (Horgan 1979; 2002; Allegro *et al.* 2004a), 'the teacher of' (García Martínez 1996) and 'the Teacher of' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), while Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996) go so far as to restore 'the Teacher of [Righteousness]'. While we are unable to judge with any certainty (it may, for example, have read מורה [היחיד]; cf. CD 20.1), the restoration מורה [הצדק] is certainly plausible in the light of our examination so far of the LSL.

It should also be noted that 4Q163 frag.23, 2.15-20 contains in the lemma the text of Isaiah 30.19-21 concerning 'your teacher' (MT: מורִיךְ) and the dictation: 'This is the way; walk in it' (זֶה הַדֶּרֶךְ לִבּוֹ בּוֹ; Isaiah 30.21). Unfortunately the pesher to these lines is almost entirely missing so we can only speculate as to what the pesharist may have made of them. The association between the 'teacher' and 'the way' elsewhere though (e.g. CD 1.10-11a; cf. 1QH^a 10.9b-10; 12.23b-25a) would strongly suggest the employment of מורה

¹⁰⁰ Horgan does not explicitly identify 4Q163 frag.21, 1-2 as Isaiah 29.17 though does acknowledge the possibility (1979, p.118; cf. 2002).

גל ה צדק in the pesher.¹⁰¹ ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ may also have appeared in 4Q165 (4QpIsa⁶) in a lacuna immediately followed by גל ה את תורה הצדק (4Q165 frags 1-2, 3); such is the suggestion of García Martínez (1996), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997), Horgan (1979) and Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996).

4.2.3.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’

4Q163 frags 4-6, 1.6-10

The sobriquet מפי הכזב does not appear in 4Q163, though one passage is worthy of mention simply because it quotes Isaiah 9.13-16 (a scriptural passage we have already examined in relation to the ‘spouter’ in Chapter Three) and thus may once have contained reference to ‘the Spouter of the Lie’:

Frgs 4-6, 1.6[... “And YHWH has cut off from Israel head and tail, palm branch and reed in one day; elders ⁷[and dignitaries are the head and מורה שקר] is the tail. ⁸[Those who led this people led them astray {מחעים}], and those who were led by them are swallowed up. Therefore ⁹[the Lord does not rejoice over his young men, and with his orphans and] his [wi]dows he has no compassion.” ¹⁰[Its interpretation: ...]. (4Q163 frags 4-6, 1.6-10)

The lemma, as already seen, refers to ‘a prophet who teaches falsehood’ or ‘a prophet, a teacher of falsehood’ (נביא מורה שקר; 4Q163, frags 4-6, 1.7).¹⁰² Moreover he is described as having ‘led them astray’ (מחעים; 1.8) causing the people to be ‘[swa]llowed up’ (מב[לעים]; 1.8). The root חעה is used in conjunction with the ‘spouter’ throughout the sectarian texts we have examined hitherto and the description ‘a prophet who teaches falsehood’ is virtually synonymous with our understanding so far of the title ‘the Spouter of the Lie’.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Indeed, Jonathan Campbell regards Isaiah 30.20-21 as having directly influenced the presentation of מורה צדק in the first column of the Damascus Document (1995a, pp.51-67).

¹⁰² Rendered by the *NRSV*, ‘prophets who teach lies’; cf. ‘the prophet, the teacher of lies’ (Horgan 1979; 2002) and ‘the prophet, the Teacher of Lies’ (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

¹⁰³ It is also perhaps of interest that the root בלע is associated with ‘the Man of the Lie’ in 1QpHab 5.8-12 and ‘the Wicked Priest’ in 1QpHab 11.2-15 (cf. ‘mediators of a lie’ and ‘seers of deceit’ in 1QH^a 12.6b-12). Clearly, no matter on what grounds we distinguish these sobriquets,

While the peshar is entirely missing it is tempting to speculate that נביא מורה would have been interpreted in reference to מטיף הכזב.¹⁰⁴ Certainly, as John Reeves points out, the “antithetical construction” מורה שקר (Isaiah 9.14; Habakkuk 2.18) allows us perhaps greater insight into the sectarian understanding of מורה הצדק (1988, p.290).

4.2.3.3. Sobriquets in 4QPesher on Isaiah^c

The occurrence of [...] מורה in 4Q163 frag.21, 6 lends itself to the restoration מורה [הצדק] (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). While מורה [היחיד] (cf. CD 20.1) would likewise be possible, the prevalence so far of the former title in the LSL (and apparent absence of the latter) renders ‘the Teacher of [Righteousness]’ the more likely alternative. Unfortunately nothing much can be learnt from the context other than an association with the ‘Lebanon’. Intriguingly ‘Lebanon’ is interpreted in reference to ‘the council of the Community’ (עצה) מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 11.17 – 12.5a, supporting perhaps our reading of מורה הצדק in this passage (cf. 1Q14 frags 8-10, 5-9a). ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ may also have appeared in 4Q163 frag.23, 2.15-20 (and 4Q165 frags 1-2, 3), while נביא מורה שקר may have been interpreted in reference to ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (4Q163 frags 4-6, 1.6-10).¹⁰⁵

there are terminological overlaps which indicate that the issue of their development is a complex one that may have resulted in a plurality of readings (just as we witness today).

¹⁰⁴ Though note 1QpHab 12.10-14.

¹⁰⁵ Allegro (1968) also read [הב] ויהן הרשע in 4Q163 frag.30, 3 (cf. Abegg, Bowley and Cook 2003; Allegro *et al.* 2004a; Bengtsson 2000a, p.51), though this is not acknowledged by Lim (2000b; 2002, p.70) who lists the sobriquet as occurring only in 1QpHab and 4Q171. Indeed, as Horgan comments, the fragment is “almost completely illegible” (1979, p.122) and nothing is preserved of the context. In either case, as Bengtsson notes, “no coherent information can be retrieved from this fragment” (2000a, p.51, n.4).

4.2.4. 4QPesher on Psalms^a

4.2.4.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'

4Q171 1.25 – 2.1

The first of several important passages we shall examine from 4Q171 (4QpPs^a) is from the bottom of the first column:

¹²⁵["Be si]lent before [YHWH and] wait for him, and do not be angry with the one who makes his way prosperous, with the man ²⁶[who mak]es evil plots." Its [interpretation] concerns אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב who led many astray with words of ²⁷falsehood, for they chose worthless things and did not lis[ten] to מַלְיָן דַּעַת, so ²¹they will perish by the sword and by hunger and by plague. (4Q171 1.25 – 2.1)

In the pesher on Psalms 37.7 we find reference to מַלְיָן דַּעַת (4Q171 1.27), a designation already encountered in the Hodayot (1QH^a 10.13) and which we there rendered 'a mediator of knowledge' (cf. Richardson 1955, esp. p.167). Given the trend we have noted for indefinite designations in the ESL to acquire the definite article in the LSL (e.g. מִטְיָף הַכֹּזֵב; מוֹרֵה הַצַּדִּיק; אֲנָשֵׁי הָאֱמֶת), it is in fact somewhat surprising that we do not also find מַלְיָן דַּעַת in definite form.¹⁰⁶

In 1QH^a 10.13-15a, מַלְיָן דַּעַת is used of the protagonist of the Hodayot who is associated with both the 'elect of righteousness' (בְּחִירֵי צַדִּיק) and 'men of truth' (אֲנָשֵׁי אֱמֶת) as well as 'wonderful mysteries' (רָזֵי פִלְאָ). We speculated that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' may have at least been perceived retrospectively as this figure (see n.16 above), and in 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a is explicitly associated with 'mysteries' (רָזִים), 'the righteous' (צַדִּיקִים) and 'the Men of Truth' (אֲנָשֵׁי הָאֱמֶת). In our present passage, 'the Man of the Lie' has 'led many astray' so that they 'did not lis[ten] to מַלְיָן דַּעַת' (4Q171 1.26-27). Similarly in a passage from the Pesher on Habakkuk we find:

¹⁰⁶ Note however the following suggested renderings: 'the Mediator of Knowledge' (Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a); 'the interpreter of knowledge' (Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004); 'the Interpreter of Knowledge' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002); 'the spokesmen for true knowledge' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

^{2,1}[...The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with the Man of ²the Lie, for [they did] not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of ³God (1QpHab 2.1-3a).¹⁰⁷

Not only do these passages both indicate the oppositional role played by ‘the Man of the Lie’, but they also emphasise the importance attached to the words of a didactic figure, just as listening to ‘the voice of מורה צדק’ is lauded in CD 20.27-34 (cf. 1QH^a 12.23b-25a). We might conclude therefore, with Bengtsson, that “probably מליין דעת also denotes the Teacher” (2000a, p.182; cf. pp.207-208), at least in 4Q171.¹⁰⁸

We must ask consequently why we do not simply find מורה הצדק in 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1, as commonly found elsewhere in the LSL (and perhaps also elsewhere in 4Q171; see below). Horgan proposes an intriguing solution; she suggests that the pesharist has seized upon מצליח דרכו (‘the one who makes his way prosperous’) in the lemma (Psalms 37.7; cf. 4Q171 1.25) and, rearranging the consonantal order of מצליח, derives מליין (Horgan 1979, p.247). Thus מליין דעת is more readily suggested than מורה הצדק. However, this hypothesis is not thoroughly convincing as מצליח דרכו in the lemma is associated with ‘the man [who mak]es evil plots’ (4Q171 1.25-26), seemingly identified in the pesher with ‘the Man of the Lie’. Instead, if we were to follow Horgan’s proposal, we might more appropriately expect מליצי תעות, מליצי, מליצי תעות, מליצי רמיה or כזב to appear in place of איש הכזב (cf. 1QH^a 10.14, 31; 12.7, 9-10). Horgan is forced to state that the interpretation is subsequently built around מליין דעת “independent of the action described in the lemma” (1979, p.247). A potentially more fruitful derivation is suggested by Jutta Jokiranta who observes

¹⁰⁷ The ‘[trai]tors in the end of days’ (1QpHab 2.5-6) likewise: ‘will not believe when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation from the mouth of the priest {הכוהן} in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all the words of his servants, the prophets, by [whose] hand God has proclaimed all that is coming upon his people’ (1QpHab 2.6-10a).

¹⁰⁸ Accepting Richardson’s proposal that מליין denotes not strictly an interpreter but an intermediary, the portrayal of the ‘teacher’ in the role of a ‘mediator’ would indeed be apt in the light of 1QpHab 2.1-10, 7.1-5 (cf. Richardson 1955, p.167).

that מַזְמוֹת ('evil plots' / 'schemes'; Psalms 37.7; 4Q171 1.26) are likewise attributed to the opponents of מַלְיָן דַּעַת in 1QH^a 10.13-17a (2005b, p.344, n.36).¹⁰⁹ If either is right, this may at least explain why מַלְיָן דַּעַת remains an indefinite designation; it has not become a title in the LSL (so מוֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק; מַטִּיף הַכּוֹז; אֲנָשִׁי הָאֵמֶת) but is instead a description suggested by the lemma and so imported directly from the ESL (1QH^a 10.13).

It would certainly appear, on the basis of comparison with 1QpHab 2.1-3a, 7.1 – 8.3a and 1QH^a 10.13-17a that the description in 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1 of an opponent of 'the Man of the Lie' as 'a mediator of knowledge' is likely in reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.¹¹⁰ This may in turn support our supposition in Chapter Three that, rightly or wrongly, the 'teacher' was perceived by readers of the Hodayot to lie behind the so-called 'Teacher Hymns'.¹¹¹

4Q171 3.14-19

A further passage of some significance from 4Q171 may, it is suggested, twice refer to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

3.14. "For by YHW[H are the steps of a man] established [and] he delights in his [w]ay, for though he [stum]bles [he will not] ¹⁵be hurled, for Y[HWH] supports his hand." Its interpretation concerns [מַלְיָן דַּעַת, הַכּוֹז, [whom] ¹⁶God [ch]ose to arise {לַעֲמֹד} [...] he established to build for him a congregation of [...] ¹⁷and] straightened his [wa]y to truth. "I have [been young] and now am old, but [I have] not [seen] the righteous {צַדִּיק} ¹⁸abandoned or his offspring begging bre[ad. All the day] he is generous and

¹⁰⁹ Jokiranta also notes the scriptural association of זֶמֶר and דַּעַת (e.g. Proverbs 1.4; 5.2; 8.12).

¹¹⁰ So too: Bengtsson 2000a, pp.182, 207-208; Brownlee 1982, p.25; Doudna 2001, p.689; Jokiranta 2005b, p.344, n.31; Knibb 1990, p.52; 1994a, p.249; Lim 2002, p.73. Charlesworth (2002, pp.83-84) chooses instead to identify מַלְיָן דַּעַת with 'the Seeker of the Law' (דוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה; e.g. CD 6.7), though this seems unlikely given that 'the Man of the Lie' and the 'teacher' are presented as contemporaries in both the ESL and the LSL while 'the Seeker of the Law' is a figure of the past/present in the preceding FSL, pre-dating the arrival of מוֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק (CD 6.2-11a; though cf. 4Q174 frag.1, 1.11-13). 'The Seeker of the Law' is nowhere contrasted with 'the Man of the Lie' and furthermore Charlesworth's subtle efforts to associate him with מַלְיָן דַּעַת on the grounds of translation ('the Interpreter of Torah' and 'the Interpreter of Knowledge' respectively) do not adequately represent the terminological differences in the underlying Hebrew.

¹¹¹ See n.16 above.

lends, and [his] offspr[ing become a blessing.” The interpretation] ¹⁹of the word concerns [מורה הצדק] [...] (4Q171 3.14-19)

In 4Q171 3.15, we find the phrase **על הכוהן מורה הצדק** in relation to Psalms 37.23-24, and in 3.18-19 we find **הדבר על מורה הצדק** in the almost entirely lost pesher on Psalms 37.25-26.¹¹² Neither **מורה הצדק** nor **מורה הצדק** [...] could be said to indisputably attest **מורה הצדק** (cf. **מורה היחיד**; CD 20.1), though it may be that such can be inferred from the context.¹¹³ In the first instance, **מורה הצדק** [...] is a further qualification of ‘the priest’ (**הכוהן**); we have already noted in the Pesher on Habakkuk that **הכוהן** would appear to be synonymous with **מורה הצדק** (cf. 1QpHab 1.16 – 2.10; 7.1-5; see n.10 above), an identification that is seemingly made explicit in 4Q171 3.15. Our present passage also refers to **ר[ב] כו** (4Q171 3.17), drawing upon the lemma (cf. 3.14), and **אמת** (3.17), both terms associated elsewhere with the ‘teacher’ (e.g. CD 1.10-11; 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a; cf. 1QH^a 10.9b-10, 13-15a; 12.23b-25a). More striking is the statement that **מורה הצדק** [...] is one ‘[whom] God [ch]ose to arise’ (**אשר בחר בו אל לעמוד**); 4Q171 3.15-16).¹¹⁴ This echoes phrases such as ‘his (God’s) elect’ (**בחריו**), made in reference to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (‘and the men of his council’?; 1QpHab 9.8-12a) and the fact that the FSL anticipates the rise (**עמד**) of ‘one who will teach righteousness’ (CD 6.10-11) while in the ESL the raising up of ‘a teacher of righteousness’ is explicitly attributed to God (CD 1.10-11).

¹¹² According to the reconstruction of Allegro (1968; followed by García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Knibb 1994a; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; cf. Allegro with Gordon 2004a). Vermes (2004) follows Allegro’s reconstruction of 4Q171 3.15 though hesitates to restore **מורה הצדק** at 3.19.

¹¹³ In fact, Allegro reads **מורה** [...] at 3.19 (1968; cf. Allegro with Gordon 2004a; Lohse 1981), though the more conservative **מורה** [...] is read by both García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Horgan (2002).

¹¹⁴ Following John Strugnell’s reading **בחר** in place of Allegro’s **בר** (Strugnell 1970, p.215).

Thus the reconstruction מורה ה[צדק] (4Q171 3.15) would appear valid, lending weight to the reading of מורה הצדק immediately below (3.19), the latter suggested also by the presence of צדיק in the lemma (Psalms 37.25).¹¹⁵ In the light of this interpretation of Psalms 37.23-24, it is also interesting to recall the words of the protagonist of the Hodayot in the ESL:

^{10.31}And you have saved me from the zeal of mediators of a lie ³²and from the congregation of seekers of smooth things. You have redeemed the life of the poor one whom they thought to finish off, spilling his blood ³³because he served you. But they did [not kn]ow that my steps come from you {מאתך מצעדִי}. (1QH^a 10.31b-33)

We might even venture that 1QH^a 10.31b-33, understood as the words of the ‘teacher’, were brought to mind by the similar concept expressed in Psalms 37.23-24 and consequently resulted in the pesharist’s inclusion of מורה הצדק at this point (while other seemingly more opportune occasions are missed; e.g. Psalms 37.12-13; cf. 4Q171 2.13-16a). Such a hypothesis must remain speculative however.

As already seen, the description of מורה הצדק as הכוהן has led some to speculate that the ‘teacher’ must have been an ousted High Priest (cf. Murphy-O’Connor 1974, pp.229-233; Stegemann 1991, p.200; 1992, pp.148-166), a claim that other scholars have refuted (e.g. Charlesworth 1980, pp.218-222; 2002, p.88, n.265).¹¹⁶ More insightful is the following comment by Bengtsson:

But too little attention has been paid to the fact that מורה ה[צדק] actually stands as an apposition to הכוהן. Consequently, the *Yahad* must have known the Teacher also as הכוהן, “the Priest” (Bengtsson 2000a, p.209)

That ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ could be referred to simply as ‘the priest’ is implied not only by 1QpHab 1.16 – 2.10 (cf. 7.1-5) but also by a further passage

¹¹⁵ Cf. van de Water 2003, p.398. However, it should be noted that, in the preceding text, the pesharist does *not* take advantage of the four occurrences of צדיק in Psalms 37.12-22 to refer to מורה הצדק, interpreting the former instead with regard to עושי התורה and עדת האביונים (4Q171 2.13 – 3.13; cf. 1QpHab 7.17 – 8.3a).

¹¹⁶ See n.10 above.

in 4Q171 which mentions ‘the priest and the men of his council’ (2.16-20; cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10). However, Bengtsson concludes that 4Q171 3.15 indicates “a change of mission”:

First being a priest, his dominating function towards the *Yahad* became teaching and expounding the scriptures. Later on he was only known by the title מורה הצדק, since this was how his community perceived him. The legitimacy as a correct teacher was more crucial for the *Yahad* than his past as a priest. (Bengtsson 2000a, p.209)

Our present examination would suggest otherwise. The expectation of מורה in the FSL (CD 6.2-11a), drawing upon Hosea 10.12, indicates that teaching was a function attributed to this figure from the very beginning and continued throughout the ESL (e.g. CD 1.11 and 20.32: מורה צדק; CD 20.1: מליץ; CD 20.14: מורה היחיד; CD 20.28: מורה; cf. 1QH^a 10.13: מליץ).¹¹⁷ By contrast, only in the LSL have we found a priestly function ascribed to the ‘teacher’ (1QpHab 1.16 – 2.10; cf. 7.1-5; 4Q171 2.16-20; cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10; 4Q171 3.14-17). Our inference must be, *contra* Bengtsson, that only at a later stage was ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ ever referred to as הכוהן and thus he may not have been attributed this role during his lifetime. It is perhaps no coincidence that we meet ‘the Wicked Priest’ (הכוהן הרשע), also referred to as simply הכוהן (1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12), only in the LSL; might the attribution of a priestly role to the ‘teacher’ be primarily in order to contrast this figure? Thus, if we are to identify any “change of mission” or reinterpretation of the ‘teacher’, rather than a move from priest to teacher (so Bengtsson 2000a, p.209) we should see instead a move that tends the other way, incorporating in these later texts a priestly function with the didactic. Such may cause problems for those scholars whose historical reconstructions latch onto the supposed priestly nature of the ‘teacher’.

¹¹⁷ Note also: ואתה אלי שמתה בפי כיורה (1QH^a 16.16).

The comment that God established מורה הצדק 'to build for him a congregation of [...]' (לבנות לו עדה [...]; 4Q171 3.16) has likewise generated discussion and led to the suggestion that the 'teacher' was the founder of the community.¹¹⁸ This is at odds however with the evidence of CD 1.4-11a which presents 'a teacher of righteousness' as having been 'raised up' for a pre-existing community (cf. CD 6.2-11a). On the one hand we may here witness a further reinterpretation of the role of the 'teacher', his role as founder being "a concept later developed" (Charlesworth 2002, p.87). Alternatively, yet still along the same lines, we saw in Chapter Three that the arrival of the 'teacher' occasioned a split within the wider movement and thus the effective creation of the Yahad, those who recognised the 'teacher of righteousness' as the anticipated figure of CD 6.10-11a. In this sense, and certainly looking back upon the event, it would be possible to accredit 'the Teacher of Righteousness' with the founding of (specifically) the Yahad. More significant for our purposes however is the parallel between the following two phrases:

^{3.15}Its interpretation concerns הכוהן מורה הצדק, [whom] ¹⁶God [ch]ose to arise [...] he established to build for him a congregation of [his elect in truth] (4Q171 3.15-16)¹¹⁹

^{10.9}The interpretation of the word concerns ממין הכזב, who led many astray ¹⁰to build a city of vanity with bloodshed and to establish a congregation in falsehood (1QpHab 10.9-10)

Though from two different texts, it is hard not to see a deliberate comparison here between the 'congregations' established by מורה הצדק and ממין הכזב respectively. There is certainly an implied parallel that we may speculate would have been noted also by early readers of these pesharim.

¹¹⁸ See, for example, the commentaries by Horgan (1979, p.219) and Knibb (1994a, p.254).

¹¹⁹ The reconstruction [בחירו באמת] עדה is suggested by Horgan (1979, p.219) and followed by Bengtsson (2000a, p.208) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997). Cf. [האמת] עדה (Dupont-Sommer 1961); [בחירו] עדה (García Martínez 1996).

4Q171 4.26b – 5.2

The final passage we shall examine with regard to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ in 4QPesher on Psalms^a is from the bottom of the fourth column (and top of the fifth):¹²⁰

^{4.26}“And my tongue is the pen of ²⁷[a skilled scribe.” Its interpretation] concerns מורה [הצדק] [... befo]re God with the answer of the tongue ^{5.1}[... and] with the lip of [...] to return together {יחד} to the מורה in [... ²...] the elect [of] Israel [...]. (4Q171 4.26b – 5.2)

Here, as at 4Q163 frag.21, 6, we have only [...] מורה (4Q171 4.27). The restoration of [הצדק] מורה however seems probable given our examination of 4Q171 3.14-19 and other passages from the LSL.¹²¹ The association with ‘tongue’ and ‘lip’ betray a possible didactic function (compare 1QH^a 12.16-17), while the phrase ‘the answer of the tongue’ (מעני לשון; 4Q171 4.27) is used also in the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’ (מענה לשון; 1QH^a 10.7; cf. 4.17; 19.33-34). The presence of יחד (4Q171 5.1), albeit in the general sense ‘together’ (Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002), and בחירני ישראל (4Q171 5.2) are likewise reminiscent of terminology used elsewhere of the ‘teacher’ (e.g. CD 20.1, 14, 27-34; 1QpHab 9.8-12a; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 5-9a; cf. 1QH^a 10.13; 12.23b-25a).

Summary

There are no indisputable occurrences of מורה הצדק in 4QPesher on Psalms^a, though [...] מורה ה (4Q171 3.15), [...] מן (3.19) and [...] מורה (4.27)

¹²⁰ The *DSSSE* (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; also García Martínez 1996) follows column 4 with frags 11-12 to reconstruct the top of column 5 (so Strugnell 1970, p.217).

¹²¹ So Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a; Bengtsson 2000a, p.211; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996.

are generally considered to partially attest this title.¹²² In particular, the presence of the definite article at 4Q171 3.15 suggests that this text contained the form מורה הצדק (as elsewhere in the LSL; e.g. 1QpHab 1.13) rather than the indefinite form found in the ESL (CD 1.11; 20.32). The ‘teacher’ is presented as a priest and the founder of a community (4Q171 3.14-17a; cf. 2.16-20) though, while some regard these as “two facts about the Teacher of Righteousness” (Horgan 1979, p.219), our examination suggests they should not be taken at face value.

A further passage identifies an opponent of ‘the Man of the Lie’ as ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (מליץ דעת; 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1), found as a self-designation in the Hodayot (1QH^a 10.13). Both in terms of context and associated terminology it would appear that this indefinite description has been imported directly from the ESL and is likely in reference to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (see n.110 above).

4.2.4.2. ‘The Spouter of the Lie’

4Q171 1.25 – 2.1

With regard to ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ in 4QPesher on Psalms^a, we shall first return to a passage already considered in relation to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’:

¹²⁵ “[Be si]lent before [YHWH and] wait for him, and do not be angry with the one who makes his way prosperous, with the man ²⁶[who mak]es evil plots.” Its [interpretation] concerns איש הכוזב who led many astray {התעה רבים} with words of ²⁷falsehood {אמרי שקר}, for they chose worthless things and did not lis[ten] to מליץ דעת, so ^{2.1}they will perish by the sword and by hunger and by plague. (4Q171 1.25 – 2.1)

Here we find once more, not מטף הכוזב, but איש הכוזב (as 1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11). ‘The Man of the Lie’ has caused many to fail to listen to ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (מליץ דעת) who, following our examination above, would appear to be ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ (see n.110 above). Such bears resemblance

¹²² See n.112 and n.121 above.

to 1QpHab 2.1-3a where אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב is associated with ‘the traitors’ who ‘[did] not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God’ (cf. 2.6-10a). As well as being pitted against מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק in 1QpHab 2.1-3a and 5.8-12, ‘the Man of the Lie’ is set at odds with the ‘teacher’ in the ESL:

^{20.13} And from the day of ¹⁴the gathering in of יורה היחיד until the end {תם} of all the Men of War who turned back ¹⁵with איש הכזב there will be about forty years. (CD 20.13b-15)

A few lines beneath our present passage, the interpretation of Psalms 37.10 reads similarly:

^{2,7}Its interpretation concerns all the wicked, at the end of ⁸forty years, who will be finished {יָהֲמוּ} and there will not be found on the earth any אִישׁ [רָשָׁע] ⁹(4Q171 2.7-9a)¹²³

We observed in Chapter Three that the ‘about forty years’ of CD 20.13b-15 was seemingly dependent upon Deuteronomy 2.14 (cf. Campbell 1995a, pp.161-171; Steudel 1993, p.238), though the proximity of 4Q171 2.7-9a to the interpretation concerning אִישׁ הַכּוֹז (1.25 – 2.1) may suggest that the forty years here (only עוֹד מֵעַם in the lemma) draws instead upon CD 20.13b-15 itself.

The presentation of אִישׁ הַכּוֹז in 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1 is so far similar to that found in both the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (ESL) and the Peshier on Habakkuk (LSL). However, there would also appear to be similarities with the description of מְטִיף הַכּוֹז in 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a. The latter was introduced as ‘the Spouter of the Lie who led many astray’ (מְטִיף) (אִישׁ הַכּוֹז אֲשֶׁר הִתְעָה רַבִּים; 1QpHab 10.9), and so here we have ‘the Man of the Lie who led many astray’ (אִישׁ הַכּוֹז אֲשֶׁר הִתְעָה רַבִּים; 4Q171 1.26). So far we have noted the persistent employment of תֵּעָה in relation specifically to the ‘spouter’, yet here it is not only used of אִישׁ הַכּוֹז but the phraseology is also

¹²³ Cf. Horgan 1979, pp.205-206.

identical to 1QpHab 10.9.¹²⁴ ‘The Spouter of the Lie’ was accused of ‘teaching them wo[r]ks of falsehood’ (ולְהוֹרֹתָם בְּמַעֲשֵׂי שֶׁקֶר; 1QpHab 10.11-12) while ‘the Man of the Lie’ is similarly accused of having led them astray ‘with words of falsehood’ (בְּאִמְרֵי שֶׁקֶר; 4Q171 1.26-27).¹²⁵ The association of שֶׁקֶר with מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב has a scriptural foundation (Micah 2.11) that is echoed in the sectarian literature, yet hitherto we have observed no precedent for the association of שֶׁקֶר with אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב. The specific terminology which thus far has distinguished the two sobriquets with regard to their function as labels here overlaps to a considerable degree.

In this light it may also be noted that the punishment decreed (‘they will perish by the sword and by hunger and by plague’; 4Q171 2.1) is a scriptural idiom, whose immediate provenance, Horgan suggests, is Jeremiah 32.24 or Ezekiel 14.21 (1979, p.204; 2002, p.11, n.7; followed by Bengtsson 2000a, p.104, n.79). However, neither of these occurrences accurately reflects the phrasing or context found in 4Q171. Instead, the phrase בַּחֶרֶב וּבָרָעַב וּבִדְבַר (4Q171 2.1) is attested in Jeremiah 14.12 (cf. Knibb 1994a, p.249) where significantly it is set in the context of false prophets, qualified by שֶׁקֶר (Jeremiah 14.13-16). Accordingly this would prove a more apt provenance and again forces us to recognise an ideological overlap between אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב in 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1 and מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב as depicted elsewhere.

Bengtsson notes that this similarity “supports the assumption that the epithets אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב and מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב refer to the same character in the Pesharim” (2000a, p.104). More intriguing however is the apparent breakdown in this passage of the terminological boundaries distinguishing these two labels. The specific resemblance to accusations made in 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a regarding ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ may suggest some dependence one way or the other, though

¹²⁴ See Bengtsson 2000a, pp.103-105.

¹²⁵ The ‘worthless things’ (קִלְלוֹת) of 4Q171 1.27 may likewise be understood in view of the ‘vanity’ (שׁוֹן) of 1QpHab 10.11; cf. Brownlee 1982, p.25. Note Koehler and Baumgartner 1996; 1999.

while the sobriquets function as distinct labels in the Pesher on Habakkuk (each with its own terminological associations) this distinction is seemingly less defined in 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1.¹²⁶

4Q171 4.13-16

While **מטִּיף הכֹּזֵב** is absent, a further passage from 4QPesher on Psalms^a does mention ‘the Man of the Lie’ once more:

4.13. “I [have seen] a wicked one {רשע}, a ruthless one, and he pres[ented] himself [as a native tree of luxuriant growth. And] I passed by before his p[la]ce but be[hold] he was [not there], and I [looked for him] but he could not ¹⁴[be found.” Its interpretation] concerns **ש[א] הכֹּזֵב** [...] ... [...] against the el[ect] of God [and loo]ked to end ¹⁵[...] ... [...] to carry out [...] ... judgement [...] acted arrogantly with a hand of deceit {רמה} ¹⁶[...] (4Q171 4.13-16)¹²⁷

The lemma (Psalms 37.35-36) recalls Psalms 37.10, the interpretation of which, concerning the end of all the wicked in forty years (4Q171 2.5-9a), we noted bore similarity to CD 20.13b-15 regarding ‘the end of all the Men of War who turned back with **אִישׁ הכֹּזֵב**’. ‘The Man of the Lie’ is also mentioned in the present passage (4Q171 4.14); Allegro reads **ש[א] הכֹּזֵב** (1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a) though note **ש[א] הכֹּזֵב** (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979, p.224; 2002).¹²⁸ Here he is the referent of ‘a wicked one, a ruthless one’ (**רשע עריץ**; 4Q171 4.13), just as this sobriquet appears in relation to **רשע** in 1QpHab 5.8-12 (cf. Horgan 1979, p.194).¹²⁹ He is also associated with ‘deceit’ (**רמה**; 4Q171 4.15), recalling the descriptions of opponents in the Hodayot; e.g.

¹²⁶ Indeed if we were to posit dependence on these grounds we would perhaps tend towards regarding 1QpHab as the earlier of the two since the distinct terminological connotations would appear to draw upon the ESL. The use of ‘spouter’ terminology to describe ‘the Man of the Lie’ in our current passage would thus result from a later understanding that perceived these labels as synonymous.

¹²⁷ On the reconstruction of the lemma, following the MT, see Horgan 1979, pp.223-224.

¹²⁸ The latter reading is also followed by Bengtsson (2000a, p.105).

¹²⁹ Such may lend further weight to the proposed reconstruction of **אִישׁ הכֹּזֵב** at 1QpHab 1.13 (Lim 2000a; 2002, pp.35-36; see however n.51 above).

1QH^a מליצי רמיה (1QH^a 10.34); דורשי רמיה (1QH^a 10.16); אנשי רמיה (1QH^a 12.7); חוזי רמיה (1QH^a 12.10); cf. 1QH^a 12.16-17.

Though the pesher is fragmentary, ‘the Man of the Lie’ would appear to be set against ‘the el[ect] of God’ (בח[יר]י אל; 4Q171 4.14). In 1QH^a 10.13-17a the ‘men of deceit’ (אנשי רמיה) are placed in opposition to ‘the elect of righteousness’ (בחירי צדק). More striking however is the use of the same phrase בחירי אל in 1QpHab 10.13 (and perhaps 1Q14 frags 8-10, 7-8; see n.99 above) in the context of ‘the Spouter of the Lie’.¹³⁰ Here is perhaps yet more evidence of the blurring of the terminological boundaries between מטף הכזב and איש הכזב in this text.

Summary

There are no occurrences of מטף הכזב in 4QPesher on Psalms^a, though we do witness two attestations of איש הכזב (4Q171 1.26; 4.14). The first places him in opposition to מליץ דעת while the second associates him with ‘deceit’ (רמה) and sets him against an elect group (בח[יר]י אל); interestingly all three of these elements are present also in 1QH^a 10.13-17a. ‘The Man of the Lie’ is presented as the referent of רשע in Psalms 37.35 (4Q171 4.13-16), in agreement with 1QpHab 5.8-12. However, in both passages terminology is used which, on the strength of our examination hitherto, we would most naturally associate with ‘the Spouter of the Lie’. In particular there are various similarities with 1QpHab 10.5b – 11.2a. Bengtsson notes that there are “parallels of contents between Habakkuk 1-2 and Ps 37.7-40” (2000a, p.105), yet the elements with which we are concerned (e.g. שקר; התעה רבים; בחירי אל) appear not to be dependent upon the lemma. Thus we must conclude that the apparent terminological boundaries distinguishing the employment of מטף הכזב and איש הכזב in, for

¹³⁰ Cf. 1QpHab 9.8-12a.

example, the Damascus Document and the Pesher on Habakkuk are not so strictly maintained in 4QPesher on Psalms^a.

Excursus: 'The Wicked Priest'

In addition to the occurrences of **הכונהן הרשע** in 1QpHab, this sobriquet is to be found on one occasion in our present text:¹³¹

^{4.7}“The wicked {רשע} watches for the righteous {צדיק} and looks [to kill him. YH]WH [will not abandon him into his hand and] n[ot] let him be condemned when he is judged.”⁸ Its interpretation concerns **הכונהן הרשע** who wa[tch]es **הצדן** [and looks to] kill him [...] and **התורה**⁹ which he sent to him, but God will not ab[andon him] and not [let him be condemned when] he is judged. But, for [him, God will] pay him his reward, giving him ¹⁰into the hand of the ruthless ones of the nations to carry out upon him [...]. (4Q171 4.7-10)

Unlike 4Q171 4.13-16 (and 1QpHab 5.8-12), where **רשע** in the lemma is interpreted with regard to **איש הכוזב**, here the referent is **הכונהן הרשע** (4Q171 4.8).¹³² Though the beginning of the sobriquet is missing, there is no good reason to doubt that the form is that attested in the Pesher on Habakkuk (**הכונהן הרשע**; 1QpHab 8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2, 8). The restoration of **הצדן** [...] **אשר צ** [...] **ה** (4Q171 4.8) on the other hand has proved more controversial. Allegro (1968) suggests **הצדן** [...] **ה** **צ** [...] **ה**, while Horgan proposes “moving frgs. 5 and 6 a little farther apart” so as to allow room for **הצדן** [...] **ה** **צ** [...] **ה**, arguing that this is justified in “the light of similar descriptions of the aggressiveness of the Wicked Priest against the Teacher of Righteousness” (1979, p.221; 2002). These “similar descriptions” are however by necessity all from the Pesher on Habakkuk and we should be wary of amalgamating these texts uncritically. Furthermore, there ‘the Wicked Priest’ is not the referent of **רשע** (unless perhaps in 1QpHab 1.12-13). Admittedly where **רשע** and **צדיק** appear together in Habakkuk 1.13, the pesher interprets the latter with regard to **מורה הצדק** (1QpHab 5.8-12; also 1.12-13),

¹³¹ See also n.105 above.

¹³² Cf. 1QpHab 1.13?

yet it also interprets the former as אִישׁ הַבּוֹז (5.8-12) at odds with 4Q171 4.7-10. Thus, while Horgan has convinced some (Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996), more likely is the less ambitious reading [צִנּוּפִי] הַצִּדִּיק.¹³³

It may nevertheless be that we should understand הַצִּדִּיק to indicate the ‘teacher’, in which case the text implies that ‘the Wicked Priest’ sought unsuccessfully to kill him (cf. 1QpHab 9.8-12a; 11.2-8), though the strong correlation between lemma and pesher in 4Q171 4.7-10 casts doubt on the historical reliability of this claim. Indeed the only elements not to be derived straightforwardly from the lemma are ‘הַתּוֹרָה which he sent to him’ (4.8-9) and the reference to the punishment of הַבּוֹזֵן הַרָשָׁע (4.9-10).¹³⁴ The latter is in agreement with 1QpHab where descriptions of this figure’s punishment are prolific (e.g. 1QpHab 8.3 – 9.12a; 11.2 – 12.10). In particular, 1QpHab 9.9-10 states that God gave him ‘into the hand of his enemies’ while 12.2-3 preserves ‘to pay him his reward’, both paralleled here.¹³⁵ On a literary level however, the passage could have been read so as to infer an attempt upon the life of the ‘teacher’ by ‘the Wicked Priest’.

While we have less material at our disposal in 4QPesher on Psalms^a, the depiction of ‘the Wicked Priest’ here is congruent with that found in the Pesher on Habakkuk. He is seemingly accused of persecuting the ‘teacher’ (4Q171 4.8; cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10; 11.4-8) and will be punished accordingly (4Q171 4.9-10; cf. 1QpHab 8.3 – 9.12a; 11.2 – 12.10). However, we do not find specific indication that he ‘ruled over Israel’ (1QpHab 8.9-10) or ‘defiled the sanctuary’ (1QpHab

¹³³ So, Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Lohse 1981. See too Bengtsson 2000a, pp.82-83, 181, n.13, 210-211; 2000b, p.265. The suggestion by Dupont-Sommer that we should restore מוֹרֵה הַצִּדִּיק (as 4Q171 3.15) is entirely implausible (1961, p.272).

¹³⁴ Strugnell suggests [הַחֲזִיק] וְהַתּוֹרָה (1970, p.216), though others read [...] וְהַתּוֹרָה (Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a) or [...] וְהַתּוֹרָה (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979, p.222; 2002).

¹³⁵ This militates against the otherwise persuasive argument by van de Water that we should restore a third negation, [וְלֹא] in 4Q171 4.9 and thus read here that הַצִּדִּיק will *not* be delivered into the hands of the nations rather than the assertion that ‘the Wicked Priest’ will be (2003, pp.414-415).

12.8-9). The limited information provided concerning ‘the Man of the Lie’ (4Q171 1.25 – 2.1; 4.13-16), and absence of **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב**, prohibits a detailed examination of the comparative function of these three sobriquets in 4Q171. Yet, while punishment is also prescribed for the followers of **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** in 4Q171 2.1, the specific terminology employed in 1.25 – 2.1 and 4.13-16, though reserved for **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** in 1QpHab, is not used of **הַכֹּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע** in 4Q171 4.7-10. Thus we are led to tentatively reaffirm the conclusions made in the light of the Pesher on Habakkuk, agreeing with Dimant that the ‘liar’ and ‘priest’ labels “have different spheres of action and characterization” (1984, p.543, n.283).¹³⁶

4.2.4.3. Sobriquets in 4QPesher on Psalms^a

There are three probable attestations of **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק** in 4QPesher on Psalms^a: [...]**מֹרֶה הַ** (4Q171 3.15); [...]**מֹן** (3.19); [...]**מֹרֶה** (4.27). The sobriquet **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב**, on the other hand, does not appear at all. Instead we have two occurrences of **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** (4Q171 1.26; 4.14) and one of **הַכֹּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע** (4.8). While the terminological context of the latter would not be out of place in the Pesher on Habakkuk and remains distinct from that of **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב**, it is significant that ‘the Man of the Lie’ is, in both 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1 and 4.13-16, described in terms that, in the light of such texts as the Damascus Document (ESL) and the Pesher on Habakkuk (LSL), we would more readily associate with ‘the Spouter of the Lie’. Coupled with the absence of **מַטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** in this text, the grounds upon which we argued that the two labels perform a distinct function in 1QpHab are undermined in 4Q171. While our conclusions hold true for the former text, we might consequently posit that these sobriquets were not used uniformly throughout the LSL.

¹³⁶ See n.86 above.

4.2.5. 4QUnidentified Peshar Fragments

4.2.5.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'

4Q172 frag.7, 1-2

A group of fourteen unidentified fragments, which may belong to pesharim texts, are grouped together by Allegro as 4Q172 (4QpUnid). Of these, fragment 7 would appear to partially attest מורה הצדק:¹³⁷

Frag.7.¹ [...] מורה הצדק [...] all [...]. (4Q172 frag.7, 1-2)

We noted this reading, [...] מורה הצדק, also in 4Q171 3.14 where we argued for the restoration מורה הצדק. So here this has been implied by Allegro who translates 'Teacher of [...]' (1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004b) and made explicit in the restored transcriptions by Charlesworth and Elledge (2002) and Horgan (1979).

Little else can be derived from the fragment, though Doudna suggests that it may have come from 4Q167 (4QpHos^b), noting Allegro's remark that the script used in these fragments is 'reminiscent' of 4Q161, 166-167 and 171 (Allegro 1968, p.50).¹³⁸ However, both Strugnell (1970, p.218) and Horgan (1979, p.263) argue for the exclusion of 4Q167 from this group. It is significant however that the presence of the definite article would again indicate the form מורה הצדק (as elsewhere in the LSL; e.g. 1QpHab 1.13) rather than the indefinite form found in the ESL (CD 1.11; 20.32).

4.2.6. 4QPesher on Psalms^b

4.2.6.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'

4Q173 frag.1, 4-5

A second Pesher on Psalms from Cave 4, 4Q173 (4QpPs^b), also refers to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

¹³⁷ Interestingly, fragment 6 contains שקר though nothing else can be ascertained; Allegro (1968) draws attention however to Psalms 38.20-21.

¹³⁸ Doudna 2003, pp.351-352.

Frag.1, 4¹³⁹[...hid]den things of מורה הצדק [...⁵... pri]est at the end of ti[me ...]. (4Q173 frag.1, 4-5)¹³⁹

The fragmentary nature of the text renders it hard to discern the context, though Allegro (1968) suggests an association with Psalms 127.2-3. The sobriquet מורה הצדק is preserved in the same definite form we have found elsewhere in the LSL and in the following line we have [...]הן לאחרית הקן[...] (4Q173 frag.1, 5), unanimously (though without certainty) restored so as to read: [...]כוןהן לאחרית הקן [...] . This reference to the '[pri]est at the end of ti[me]', if correct, recalls the 'last priests of Jerusalem' (1QpHab 9.4-5) and resembles the designation the 'last priest' (כוהן האחרון) in 4Q167 (4QpHos^b) frag.2, 3.¹⁴⁰ However, its proximity to מורה הצדק also recalls the phrase [...]הן מורה הצדק (4Q171 3.15) in the other Pesher on Psalms from Cave 4 and the occurrences of כוהן apparently in reference to the 'teacher' (1QpHab 1.16 – 2.10 [cf. 7.1-5]; 4Q171 2.16-20 [cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10]). Interestingly, while לאחרית הקן does not appear elsewhere (see Horgan 1979, p.228), the phrase [...]הן הקן is attested twice in 1QpHab 7.1 – 8.3a (cf. 1QS 4.16-17), a text concerning the 'teacher' which parallels what is said of 'the priest' in 1QpHab 1.16 – 2.10. Perhaps, given the priestly function seemingly attached to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the LSL, we might posit that in this text מורה הצדק was explicitly described as כוהן לאחרית הקן.

¹³⁹ Horgan (1979; 2002) restores [...]הן ('[hid]den things'; cf. '[secr]et things'; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Other readings include [...]הן ('[sup]lications'; Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004c) and [...]הן ('the warnings (?)'; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

¹⁴⁰ For '[pri]est at the end of ti[me]', see: Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004c; Horgan 1979. Also rendered: '[pri]est at the end of the a[ge]' (Vermes 2004); '[pri]est in the final e[ra]' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); '[pri]est at the last per[iod]' (Horgan 2002); '[pr]iest for the t[ime] to come' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

4Q173 frag.2, 1-2

A further probable reference to ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ comes from 4Q173 frag.2:

Frag.2, 1¹ [...] The interpretation of the mat[ter ... ²...] [מ]וֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק [ק] (4Q173 frag.2, 1-2)

This is the entirety of the surviving text and reveals nothing of the context. Allegro (1968) suggests an association with Psalms 127.3b on the basis of his restoration פֶּשֶׁר הַפֶּרֶן [י] (4Q173 frag.2, 1), though Strugnell (1970, p.219) amends this to פֶּשֶׁר הַפֶּתִּיגָם (cf. 4Q161 frags 2-6, 22).¹⁴¹ While the text [...] וֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק [...] could attest יוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק (cf. CD 6.11a), the absence of this designation elsewhere in the LSL and the prominence of the form מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק (cf. 4Q173 frag.1, 4) would render more probable the restoration [מ]וֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק [ק] at 4Q173 frag.2, 2.

Summary

4QPesher on Psalms^b would appear to twice attest the definite sobriquet מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק (4Q173 frag.1, 4; frag.2, 2). The fragments reveal very little with regard to context, though frag.1, 4-5 associates this figure with the ‘[pri]est at the end of ti[me]’; while the precise relationship between them is unclear, it is possible that the two are to be identified.

¹⁴¹ Also García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Horgan (1979; 2002).

4.2.7. 4QCatena A¹⁴²4.2.7.1. 'The Spouter of the Lie'¹⁴³

4Q177 1.6-10

The following passage from 4QCatena A may have some bearing upon our examination of the sobriquet **מטִיף הכֹּזב**:

^{1.6}["He] hatches [p]lots to des[troy the poor ⁷with words of falsehood {אמרי שקר}." ...] **הלצון** [...] to Israe[l "For the leader.] Of David. In YHWH [I take refuge. ⁸For, behold, the wicked bend the bow] and set arrows o[n the string, to shoot in the darkness at the upright of heart." Its interpretation: th[at they will flee, the me[n of ... ⁹... like a b]ird from its place and be exil[ed ... written about th]em in the book of [...] ¹⁰"On account of uncleanness that destroys with a griev]ous [destruction]. If a man, walking in win[d and falsehood, lies {כֹּזב} ... he would be] מטִיף [מ] for this people." [...]. (4Q177 1.6-10)¹⁴⁴

In line 7, Allegro reads **ל[ה]לעין את ישראל** which he translates 'to curse Israel' (1968; Allegro *et al.* 2004c; cf. 'to condemn Israel'; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). However, Strugnell notes that upon more careful study "on arrive à une lecture presque certaine de **הלצון**" (1970, p.242). This has been followed by Milgrom with Novakovic (2002) who restore **הלצון [אנשי]**, and by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) who restore **הלצון [איש]** (also García Martínez 1996).

¹⁴² Commonly designated 4QCatena A in relation to 4QCatena B (4Q182); cf. Allegro 1968; Tov (ed.) 2002. Note however 4QCatena^a (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997). The resemblance of 4Q177 to 4Q174 (4QFlor), noted by Strugnell (1970, p.237), has led Annette Steudel to suggest that they belong to the same document which she titles 4QMidrash on Eschatology^{a-b} (Steudel 1992); accordingly 4Q177 = 4QMidrEschat^b. In his excellent summary, Jonathan Campbell (2004, pp.45-46, 53-54) concludes that: "The safest conclusion for the time being is that this aspect of her hypothesis remains unproven and that, as a result, 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A are to be characterized 'as broadly similar but not identical works' (2004, p.54; similarly Milgrom with Novakovic 2002, p.287). Cf. 'Thematic Commentaries A-B' (4Q174, 177) in Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002, p.79.

¹⁴³ It should also be acknowledged that **דורש התורה** appears in 4Q177 2.5 (cf. CD 6.7; 7.18; 4Q174 frag.1, 1.11-13) though, as this sobriquet does not fall within the immediate scope of this examination, it is enough simply to note its presence in the LSL. We shall return to **דורש** **החלקות** (cf. 4Q177 2.12) in Chapter Five.

¹⁴⁴ Following the numbering and reconstruction of columns in DSSSE.

The former, אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן ('the Men of Scoffing'), is found in both the ESL (CD 20.11), where they are seemingly associated with 'the Man of the Lie', and the LSL (4Q162 [4QpIsa^b] 2.6, 10), where they are associated with a 'congregation' in Jerusalem and, drawing upon Isaiah 5.24, have מַאֲסוֹ אֶת הָעוֹרֶת (note the same accusation of אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב in 1QpHab 5.8-12; cf. Bengtsson 2000a, p.223). Appropriately, the designation אֲנָשֵׁי לְצוֹן, without the definite article, appears in Isaiah 28.14 in reference to a group in Jerusalem who have taken refuge in lies (כֹּזֵב) and falsehood (שֶׁקֶר).¹⁴⁵ The restoration אֲנָשֵׁי הַלְצוֹן would thus prove apt in relation to the immediately preceding citation of Isaiah 32.7 (4Q177 1.6).¹⁴⁶

On the other hand, אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן ('the Man of Scoffing'), described in CD 1.14-15 as one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie', would more readily apply to the description of he (הוּא) who 'hatches plots to destroy the poor with words of falsehood {אֲמַרִי שֶׁקֶר}' (Isaiah 32.7; cf. 4Q177 1.6).¹⁴⁷ In the ESL we speculated that אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן was an alternative designation for the figure labelled אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב (see Chapter Three, esp. n.80 and n.82). It is therefore perhaps significant that, in the LSL, 'words of falsehood' (אֲמַרִי שֶׁקֶר) are explicitly attributed to אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב and he is furthermore the referent of 'the man who makes evil plots' in Psalms 37.7 (4Q171 1.25 – 2.1).

In possible favour of the reading אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן in 4Q177 1.7, after the interpretation of Isaiah 32.7 and subsequently Psalms 11.1 (cf. 1QH^a 12.8-9; 1QpHab 11.4-6?), there follows a citation of Micah 2.10-11 (4Q177 1.10).¹⁴⁸ As previously noted, this scriptural text, coupling נִטְרָה and כֹּזֵב, likely influenced the

¹⁴⁵ See Chapter Three, n.45.

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Strugnell 1970, p.242.

¹⁴⁷ So VanderKam and Flint 2002, p.287.

¹⁴⁸ Not recognised by Allegro (1968; Allegro *et al.* 2004c; followed by Milgrom with Novakovic 2002), though pointed out by Strugnell (1970, pp.241-242) and followed by García Martínez (1996), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996); cf. VanderKam and Flint (2002, p.431).

description אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן אֲשֶׁר הָטִיף לְיִשְׂרָאֵל מִיָּמֵי כֹזֵב (CD 1.14-15) and ultimately the sobriquet מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב. It is not clear what followed this citation though, given the presence of מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב elsewhere in the LSL, an attestation of this label would be most appropriate.

With regard to אִישׁ or אָנֹשִׁי הַלְצוֹן [...] (4Q177 1.7), either אִישׁ or אָנֹשִׁי הַלְצוֹן could feasibly be restored and it is not an easy choice between these two alternatives (cf. VanderKam 2003, p.472, n.22). In order to be safe, given the otherwise apparent absence of the title אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן in the LSL, we should perhaps more cautiously restore אָנֹשִׁי הַלְצוֹן (as attested twice in 4Q162 2.6-10). However, the nature of Isaiah 32.7 and the similarities with the exposition of Psalms 37.7 in 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1 leave open the possibility that the singular designation (hitherto found only in CD 1.14) may have been employed.

4.3. Conclusions

Unlike the Formative or Early Sectarian Layers, the Late Sectarian Layer *does* attest both מְטִיף הַכֹּזֵב and מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק. Not only that, but these forms are used consistently (with one exception: מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק; 1QpHab 2.2).¹⁴⁹ With regard to מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק, in total there are eight full occurrences of the form (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 6; 4Q173 frag.1, 4) and six partial attestations (4Q163 frag.21, 6; 4Q171 3.15; 3.19; 4.27; 4Q172 frag.7, 1; 4Q173 frag.2, 2), in addition to מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק (1QpHab 2.2).¹⁵⁰ The prevalence of the form מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק in this textual layer, and the preservation of the definite article in some cases, suggests that these partial attestations should all

¹⁴⁹ According to Milik (1952; 1955) also מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק (1Q14 frags 8-10, 6), though see Horgan 1979, p.60 (cf. Bengtsson 2000a; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 2002).

¹⁵⁰ The restoration of מוֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק has also been suggested by some scholars at 1Q14 frag.11, 4 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 4Q165 frags 1-2, 3 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) and 4Q171 4.8 (Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); these are highly speculative however.

likewise be restored מורה הצדק (as opposed to the indefinite form מורה צדק found in the ESL [CD 1.11; 20.32] or the designations יורה הצדק [CD 6.11a] or מורה / יורה היחיד [CD 20.1; 20.14] found in the FSL and ESL respectively though entirely absent from the LSL). This figure is also seemingly described as ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (מליץ דעת; 4Q171 1.27) and ‘the priest’ (הכוהן; 1QpHab 2.8; 4Q171 2.19; 3.15 [and 4Q173 frag.1, 5?]); while the former draws upon 1QH^a 10.13 (ESL) the latter would appear innovative to this textual layer.

With regard to מטיף הכוזב, there are two full occurrences of the form (1QpHab 10.9; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 4) and one probable partial attestation (1QpHab 10.17 – 11.1).¹⁵¹ The context of the latter, and preservation of the definite article, suggests that the form מטיף הכוזב should be restored (as opposed to איש הכוזב or the indefinite form מטיף כוזב found in the ESL [CD 8.13]). In addition, the sobriquet איש הכוזב appears four times (1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11; 4Q171 1.26; 4.14) and הכוהן הרשע six (1QpHab 8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2; 12.8; 4Q171 4.8).¹⁵² While the former appeared once in the ESL (CD 20.15), the latter (described also as הכוהן; 1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12) is unique to the LSL. There are two occurrences of אנשי הלצון (4Q162 2.6; 2.10) and one, הלצון [...] (4Q177 1.7), that could be restored to read either [אנשי] הלצון (cf. CD 20.11 [ESL]; 4Q162 2.6; 2.10 [LSL]) or [איש] הלצון (cf. CD 1.14 [ESL]).

In terms of context and terminology, the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכוזב are thoroughly consistent with their indefinite counterparts in the ESL (with the addition of one or two notable innovations; e.g. the priestly role assigned to the ‘teacher’). Thus our most significant observation must be the shift

¹⁵¹ The restoration of [מטיף] (sic) has tentatively been suggested at 1QpHab 9.16 (Lim 1993a, p.422), while מטיף הכוזב may have at one time appeared in the pesher following Isaiah 9.13-16 in 4Q163 frags 4-6, 1.6-10 and following the citation of Micah 2.10-11 in 4Q177 1.6-10.

¹⁵² Furthermore, it has been suggested that one or the other be restored at 1QpHab 1.13 (see the discussion above). הכוהן הרשע may perhaps also be found at 4Q163 frag.30, 3 (see n.105 above).

from an indefinite form to a consistently definite one and, by implication, from a descriptive function to an appellative one.¹⁵³ Hence, only in the LSL would we appear to meet the titles ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ and ‘the Spouter of the Lie’. With regard to the latter, its role as a distinct label in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (despite its appearance alongside **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** and **הַכֹּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע**) is highlighted by the specific use of terminology and thematic association, drawing upon the occurrences of the ‘spouter’ in the ESL (CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26). Its very employment by the pesharist, rather than simply reusing **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** for example, demonstrates the fact that it performs a distinct function; consequently the two cannot be straightforwardly equated.¹⁵⁴ The use of ‘spouter’ connotations in relation to **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב** in 4Q171 1.25 – 2.1 and 4.13-16 however suggests that these terminological boundaries are not consistent and are apparently less defined in 4QPesher on Psalms^a.

Having now completed our survey of all apparent occurrences of the sobriquets **מֹרֵה הַצֶּדֶק** and **מִטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב** (along with ‘variant’ forms and related terminology where appropriate) across these three sectarian textual layers, we shall, in the next chapter, consider the overall developmental process we have witnessed in the hope that further light can be shed upon the shifting form and function of sobriquets in the Qumran-related literature.

¹⁵³ Similarly, **אֲנָשֵׁי אֱמֶת** (‘men of truth’; 1QH^a 6.2; 10.14 [ESL]) and **אֲנָשֵׁי הָאֱמֶת** (‘the Men of Truth’; 1QpHab 7.10 [LSL]).

¹⁵⁴ Nevertheless, for scholars in pursuit of the historical question, these distinct labels (along with **הַכֹּוֹהֵן הָרָשָׁע** perhaps?) may have applied to the same figure (at least for some readers; the possibility cannot be ignored that these labels were understood differently by different readers).

5.

The Development of the Qumran Sobriquets

5.1. Introduction

In the previous three chapters we have examined in turn the Formative, Early and Late Sectarian Layers, according to the broad chronological layering of textual material (notably that classed as D-, H- and P-material) established in Chapter One. In particular our examination has focussed on the (apparent) variant forms of the sobriquets **מטרי הכזב** and **מורה הצדק** to be found across these layers, along with related designations where appropriate.

In this present chapter we shall firstly review our findings so far, thus drawing tentative conclusions as to the seemingly developmental process witnessed, before further demonstrating this observed trend by means of a supplementary case study involving the group sobriquet, 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (**דורשי החלקות**). We shall follow this with some discussion of the varying use and function of sobriquets across the sectarian textual layers as well as noting the problems with our developmental model. In the latter part of the chapter we shall compare our results with the insights to be garnered from a sociological approach, specifically one drawing upon the sociology of deviance and 'labelling theory'. In this manner we will seek independent confirmation of this thesis' findings, examining their compliance with research carried out in another academic field, and hope to illustrate both the labelling process and apparent development of 'master status' attested by the Qumran-related sobriquets.

5.2. The Evidence for Sobriquet Development

5.2.1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie'

In the FSL we examined the pre-Yahadic D-material, in particular CD 5.20 – 6.11a.¹ There we found a professed expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness {יורה הצדק} at the end of days' (CD 6.11a), drawing primarily upon Hosea 10.12 in terms of terminology and context (though to a lesser extent perhaps also Joel 2.23). This designation, set firmly in the scriptural context of 'seeking' God (CD 6.6-7; cf. Hosea 10.12) and utilising similar phraseology (CD 6.10-11: עד-יבוא ויורה צדק; Hosea 10.12: עד עמד יורה הצדק), appeared to attest an implicit reliance upon the scriptural passage (Campbell 1995a, pp.88-99) and would seem to be our earliest instance of any antecedent form of מורה הצדק.

The יורה הצדק of CD 6.11 is ideologically lined up with 'the holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש; CD 6.1) who were the instruments of God's teaching in the past.² These are set in opposition to those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר; 6.1), a designation seemingly drawing upon the language of Jeremiah 23.25-32. The latter are further characterised as having 'moved the boundary' (מסיגי הגבול; CD 5.20) and 'led Israel astray' (יחעו; CD 5.20).³ While no counterpart to the eschatological יורה הצדק is mentioned (perhaps none was expected?), the language was clearly in place to describe such a figure.

In the ESL we looked first at the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document where we found the indefinite designation 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק; CD 1.11; 20.32; cf. 20.28). The redaction of CD 1.4-11a presents

¹ Partially paralleled in 4Q266 (frag.3, 2.7-17a), 4Q267 (frag.2, 4-15) and 6Q15 (frag.3, 2b-5). Our identification of pre-Yahadic D-material was based primarily upon the redaction history posited by Philip Davies (1983) and discussed in Chapter One.

² משיחו הקודש corrected from משיחו הקודש, following 4Q267 frag.2, 6; 6Q15 frag.3, 4 (cf. Fitzmyer 2000, pp.88-90; Qimron 1992a; Rabinowitz 1954, p.20, n.41).

³ Cf. Jeremiah 23.13 (יחעו את-עמי את-ישראל).

this figure as having been raised up for the ‘root of planting’ in direct response to their act of ‘seeking’ God (דרשוהו; 1.10), reminiscent of both Hosea 10.12 and CD 6.2-11a. Our analysis demonstrated however that the influence of Hosea 10.12 upon the passage relates primarily to the pre-Yahadic text and that the specific formation of the label מורה צדק owes more to the professed expectation of ‘one who will teach righteousness’ in CD 6.2-11a.⁴ The description ‘a teacher of righteousness’ is seemingly applied to a figure titled ‘the Teacher of the Community’ (מורה / יורה היחיד; CD 20.1; 20.14), thus portraying him (in what may be a distinctly polemical move in the face of opposition) as indeed the anticipated יורה הצדק.

Similar language to that used of the ‘teacher’ appeared in relation to the protagonist of the Hodayot (note in particular 1QH^a 12.23b-25a and the play on ירה in 16.16-17). More specifically he was described in a didactic role as ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (מליץ דעת; 1QH^a 10.13) and associated with the ‘elect of righteousness’ (בחיירי צדק; 10.13) and ‘[men] of truth’ (אנשי אמת; 10.14). A passage from 4QCommentary on Genesis A was also examined and found to contain reference to ‘the Messiah of Righteousness’ (משיח הצדק; 4Q252 5.3). The fact that this figure is associated in some way with ‘the sceptre’ (המחקק; 5.2; cf. CD 6.2-11a) and ‘the Men of the Community’ (אנשי היחד; 5.5; cf. CD 20.27-34) suggested some continuity with the ‘teacher’ designations of the Damascus Document, though our analysis ruled a straightforward identification with the figure designated מורה צדק unlikely.

While it may have been thought that the eschatological יורה הצדק would be universally recognised and thus unopposed (cf. CD 6.2-11a), the presence of disparaging epithets in the ESL would suggest that the figure acclaimed as such did indeed encounter opposition. In CD 1.10-18a we observed

⁴ In this light, the oft-noted dependence of מורה צדק upon Hosea 10.12 (e.g. Campbell 1995a, pp.51-67; Schechter 1970, p.63, n.16) is better understood as coming vicariously through CD 6.2-11a (so Davies 1988).

that the **מורה צדק** is set against 'the Man of Scoffing' (**איש הלצון**; 1.14) who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (**הטיף לישראל מימי כזב**; 1.14-15), suggestive of false prophecy.⁵ Moreover he is further accused of having 'led them astray' (**יִתְעַם**; 1.15) so as 'to remove the boundary' (**לְסִיעַ גְּבוּל**; 1.16), reminiscent of the description of those who 'prophesied falsehood' (**יִנְבְּאוּ שֶׁקֶר**) in CD 5.20 – 6.2. The specific accusation of having 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' is revisited in the indefinite description **מטיף כזב** (CD 8.13; cf. 4.19-20; 19.25-26), drawing upon Micah 2.6-11 and thus providing an apt foil to **מורה צדק**. Furthermore, it appeared on balance that the designation 'the Man of the Lie' (**איש הכזב**; 20.15), associated with 'the Men of Scoffing' (**אנשי הלצון**; 20.11), may well have been understood (by the readership at least) as synonymous with **איש הלצון**.

Once again similar terminology was to be found in the *Hodayot*, describing the opposition in terms of false teaching and prophecy. While the constructions **מטיף כזב**, **איש הלצון** and **איש הכזב** were absent, we did find reference to: scoffers (**לְצִיִּים**; 1QH^a 10.11); 'mediators of error' (**מְלִיצֵי תַעוּת**; 10.14); 'seers of error' (**חֹזֵי תַעוּת**; 12.20); 'mediators of deceit' (**מְלִיצֵי רַמְיָה**; 12.7); 'seers of deceit' (**חֹזֵי רַמְיָה**; 12.10); 'seekers of deceit' (**דּוֹרְשֵׁי רַמְיָה**; 10.34); 'men of deceit' (**אֲנָשֵׁי רַמְיָה**; 6.14; 10.16); 'men of deception' (**אֲנָשֵׁי**; 12.20); 'mediators of a lie' (**מְלִיצֵי כֹזֵב**; 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]); 'prophets of a lie' (**נְבִיאֵי כֹזֵב**; 12.16).⁶ While indefinite and plural, the use of roots such as **לִיץ** and **כֹּזֵב** (as well as **תַּעַה**) betray some functional similarity with the labels **איש הלצון** and **איש הכזב** to be found elsewhere in the ESL, along with the description **מטיף כזב**.

⁵ Cf. Micah 2.6-11.

⁶ Also 'seekers of smooth things' (**דּוֹרְשֵׁי חֲלָקוֹת**; 1QH^a 10.15; 10.32; cf. 12.7; 12.10) and, according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997), 'mediators of falsehood' (**מְלִיצֵי שֶׁקֶר**; 14.19). See further, Holm-Nielsen (1960, pp.292-293) and Mansoor (1961, p.51).

In the LSL we examined a number of the pesharim and found that the definite form **מורה הצדק** was consistently employed (with one exception: **מורה הצדקה**; 1QpHab 2.2) rather than any of the other explicit ‘teacher’ designations encountered in the FSL or ESL (e.g. **מורה צדק**; **מורה הצדק**; **מורה / יורה היחיד**).⁷ There are eight full occurrences of the form (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 6; 4Q173 frag.1, 4) and six partial attestations (4Q163 frag.21, 6; 4Q171 3.15; 3.19; 4.27; 4Q172 frag.7, 1; 4Q173 frag.2, 2).⁸ Conceptual and contextual similarities indicate that the same figure titled **מורה / יורה היחיד** in the ESL and *described* as **מורה צדק** (drawing upon the expectation of **מורה הצדק** in the FSL), is here known instead by the sobriquet **מורה הצדק**. This figure is further described as ‘a mediator of knowledge’ (**מליץ דעת**; 4Q171 1.27), drawing upon 1QH^a 10.13, and (seemingly innovative to the LSL) ‘the priest’ (**הכוהן**; 1QpHab 2.8; 4Q171 2.19; 3.15 [and 4Q173 frag.1, 5?]).

Similarly, while the label **איש הלצון** is ostensibly absent, the description of this character in the ESL as **מטיף כזב** was found to be preserved in definite form in the LSL as the designation **מטיף הכזב** (1QpHab 10.9; 10.17 – 11.1[?]; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 4).⁹ In addition to this sobriquet we observed the continued employment of **איש הכזב** (1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11; 4Q171 1.26; 4.14) and **אנשי הלצון** (4Q162 2.6; 2.10), both present in the ESL.¹⁰ It is notable that the sobriquet **הכוהן הרשע** is unique to the LSL (1QpHab 8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2; 12.8;

⁷ Milik (1952; 1955) reads **מורי הצדק** in 1Q14 (frags 8-10, 6), though see Horgan 1979, p.60 (cf. Bengtsson 2000a; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 2002).

⁸ See further Chapter Four, n.150.

⁹ See further Chapter Four, n.151.

¹⁰ Cf. 4Q177 1.7: **הלצון** [אנשי] or **הלצון** [איש].

4Q171 4.8).¹¹ This may in turn shed light upon the positive description of מורה הצדק as 'the priest', peculiar to this layer. Our analysis suggested that while the specific use of terminology and thematic association in 1QPesher on Habakkuk presented מטיף הכזב as effectively distinct from איש הכזב or הכוהן הרשע, these boundaries were not consistent and were for example less defined in 4QPesher on Psalms^a.

With regard to the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב it is significant that they do not in fact appear in this form until our final sectarian layer despite the presence of so-called 'variant' forms in earlier layers. It is the contention of this thesis that a developmental process can be witnessed, drawing initially upon scriptural terminology and typologies but increasingly upon previous sectarian textual layers. Thus we find specific elements of contextualised scriptural terminology being adopted and re-employed within the tradition of sectarian literature (as for example the indefinite descriptive forms מורה צדק and מטיף כזב, themselves the product of scriptural exegesis) before arriving ultimately at the definite seemingly titular forms found in the LSL.

Our examination has noted the subtle complexities of this process, manifest in the use and repetition of associated terminology and the explicit, or often implicit, influence of relevant scriptural and/or sectarian passages. So for example with regard to מטיף הכזב we have uncovered a web of inter-related texts and root forms that lie behind the epithet, providing an extensive *implicit context* which itself may then influence the subsequent employment of the sobriquet.¹² In effect we have witnessed the *development* of these sobriquets from

¹¹ Cf. הכוהן הרשע (1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12). הכוהן הרשע may perhaps also be found at 4Q163 frag.30, 3 (see Chapter Four, n.105). It has further been suggested that either איש הכזב or הכוהן הרשע be restored at 1QpHab 1.13 (see the relevant discussion in Chapter Four).

¹² Thus an implicit association of מטיף הכזב with, for example, Isaiah 9.13-15, 28.10-15, Jeremiah 23.9-32, Ezekiel 13.1-16, Micah 2.6-11, 3.5-10 and CD 1.10-18a, 4.19-20, 5.20 – 6.2, 8.12-13, 19.24b-26a (and accordingly: נטף, כזב, שקר, ליץ, תעה, בנה, צו, עדה), would appear to have influenced both its *inclusion* in the interpretation of Habakkuk 2.12-13 (1QpHab 10.5b-13; e.g. noting the presence of בונה in the lemma) and moreover the specific direction taken by

scriptural reference to sectarian terminology, noting in the process the ultimate acquisition of a definite form.

5.2.2. 'The Seekers of Smooth Things'

5.2.2.1. The Formative Sectarian Layer

One further example may be desirable in order to more confidently illustrate this developmental process. We shall therefore briefly turn our attention to another sobriquet that clearly exhibits the same trend, 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (דורשי החלקות), and track its development across our three sectarian layers.¹³ As listed in Chapter One, 'variant' forms of the label appear in the scrolls. However the only one to fall within the Formative Sectarian Layer comes from the first column of the (pre-Yahadic) Cairo Damascus Document where, in reference to 'a congregation of traitors' (עדת בוגדים; CD 1.12; cf. 2.1), it states:

^{1.18}For they sought smooth things {דורשו בחלקות} and chose illusions and watched for
¹⁹breaches and chose the fair neck. (CD 1.18-19a)¹⁴

Significantly, this passage attests a verbal form (דורשו) rather than the construct noun witnessed in the 'standard' form of the sobriquet. Here it functions as the first in a list of accusations brought against the עדת בוגדים and would appear to have a scriptural foundation in Isaiah 30.9-11:

^{30.9}For they are a rebellious people, faithless children, children who will not hear the instruction of the LORD; ¹⁰who say to the seers, 'Do not see'; and to the prophets, 'Do

the peshet itself (e.g. the establishment of 'a congregation in falsehood' (עדה בשקר); 1QpHab 10.10).

¹³ This literal rendition of the epithet (following Allegro *et al.* 2004d, Knibb 1994a, Vermes 2004 and others), which "encompasses the polemic content intended with this sobriquet, but is open to different specific interpretations" (Bengtsson 2000a, p.135) is preferable to other more interpretive translations such as 'the Flattery-Seekers' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or 'those looking for easy interpretations' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997). For a summary of historical hypotheses regarding this designation, see Bengtsson 2000a (pp.110-114) and Callaway 1988 (pp.164-168).

¹⁴ Partially paralleled in 4Q266 frag.2, 1.21-22.

not prophesy to us what is right; speak to us smooth things {דברו־לנו חלקות}, prophesy illusions, ¹⁵leave the way, turn aside from the path, let us hear no more about the Holy One of Israel.' (Isaiah 30.9-11)

Here, as in CD 1.18-19, חלקות are coupled with מַהְתְּלוֹת. A reference to 'a breach' (פֶּרֶץ) also appears in Isaiah 30.13, further strengthening the case for a dependence of CD 1.18-19a upon this passage.¹⁵

The Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document identifies the עֲדָת בִּוְגְדִים with 'the last generation' and the followers of 'the Man of Scoffing' (CD 1.11b-18a). Accordingly the accusation of seeking smooth things and preferring illusions is, in its new context, brought against those who rejected the 'teacher' (CD 1.10 – 2.1). Interestingly, the rival pedagogical figure is said to have 'led them astray in a wilderness without a way' (1.15) and they are further described as 'those who departed from the way' (1.13) and who 'depart from the paths of righteousness' (1.15-16). These elements may likewise draw to an extent upon Isaiah 30.9-11 where we have not only 'speak to us smooth things, prophesy illusions' but also 'leave the way, turn aside from the path'.

Having established the influence of Isaiah 30.9-11 we must ask whence דָּרַשׁ (CD 1.18) since it does not appear in the scriptural passage. We might argue that the 'rebellious people' of Isaiah 30.9 are in fact by implication actively 'seeking' חלקות by virtue of their request, though such does not provide provenance for the root. Instead we might well highlight the presence of the positive appellation דֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה in the pre-Yahadic text (CD 6.7) and posit some dichotomy between the two expressions (cf. Bengtsson 2000a, pp.117-118). More revealing however is the use of דָּרַשׁ in CD 1.10, especially when we consider that, according to our analysis, prior to Yahadic redaction the text currently preserved in CD 1.10-19a would have read simply:

¹⁵ Cf. Campbell 1995a, p.56. Håkan Bengtsson regards Psalms 12.3-4 as equally influential upon the designation (2000a, pp.117-120), though the present examination is unconvinced, at least with regard to this specific (earliest) occurrence. Note also Ezekiel 12.24; Psalms 5.10; Daniel 11.32.

But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him [דרשוהו] with a whole heart. And he made known to later generations what he had done to a congregation of traitors, for they sought smooth things {דרשו בחלקות} and chose illusions and watched for breaches and chose the fair neck.¹⁶

Thus the remnant who sought God are contrasted with the ערת בוגדים who instead 'sought smooth things'. The seeking of God in CD 1.10 is comparable with that in 6.2-11a (which plays on Hosea 10.12), shown for example by the inclusion of מורה צדק in the redaction of the passage. The influence of Hosea 10.12 upon the pre-Yahadic passage above is further demonstrated by the presence of טוב הצואר in CD 1.19 (cf. Hosea 10.11). CD 1.10 – 2.1 would appear therefore to provide us with a suitably transparent context for the pairing of דרש and חלק. Specifically, the reason we find חלק coupled with דרש and not דבר (Isaiah 30.10) is on account of the prevalent theme of 'seeking' in the pre-Yahadic layer of the text (deriving ultimately from Hosea 10.12) and in order to contrast the remnant who sought God (CD 1.10; 6.6).

This attestation in the FSL arguably represents contextualised scriptural terminology, reliant primarily upon the scriptural passage that underlies it. Hence this reference to the seeking of 'smooth things' remains coupled with the same preference for 'illusions' that appears in Isaiah 30.9-11.¹⁷ Rather than a specific epithet we have a description thoroughly grounded in the scriptural text and applied to a group who are twice described as 'a congregation' (CD 1.12 and 2.1) and later, in the redaction belonging to the ESL, associated with the followers of איש הלצון.

¹⁶ Following Davies' identification of pre-Yahadic material (1983, pp.232-235).

¹⁷ Likewise פרץ (Isaiah 30.13; CD 1.19). Isaiah 30.9-11 may also have influenced the redaction of CD 1.11b-18a.

5.2.2.2. The Early Sectarian Layer

In the Early Sectarian Layer we find a similar pairing of **חלק** and **דרש** on two occasions within the so-called ‘Teacher Hymns’ of the Hodayot:¹⁸

^{10.14}And I have become a man of dispute to mediators of error [but a man of ¹⁵pea]ce to all seers of truth. And I have become a spirit of zeal against seekers of smoo[th things] {דרשי חלקות}. (1QH^a 10.14-15) [= Sukenik 2.14-15]

^{10.31}And you have saved me from the zeal of mediators of a lie ³²and from the congregation of seekers of smooth things {דרשי חלקות}. (1QH^a 10.31-32) [= Sukenik 2.31-32]¹⁹

Interestingly these attest an indefinite construct form (hence ‘seekers of smooth things’) comparable with those designations found elsewhere in the Hodayot (e.g. מליצי כזב, חוזי רמיה, etc.).²⁰ James VanderKam suggests that מליצי כזב and דורשי חלקות in 1QH^a 10.31-32 are “poetic parallels” (2003, p.476; Holm-Nielsen 1960, p.48, n.3) and indeed we have already noted in Chapter Three the likely synonymity of the Hodayot’s pejorative expressions. In this light it is noteworthy that just two lines later we also find the designation ‘seekers of deceit’ (דורשי רמיה; 1QH^a 10.34).²¹

With regard to דורשי חלקות it is significant that the description would appear dependent upon the FSL not only for the coupling of **דרש** and **חלק** but also for the portrayal of this group as a ‘congregation’ (עדה; 1QH^a 10.32; cf. CD 1.12; 2.1), there being no other discernible provenance for the term in the Hodayot. No other elements of Isaiah 30.9-11, ‘such as the preference for

¹⁸ See Chapter Three, n.109.

¹⁹ Note also however the use of **חלק** as a verb in 1QH^a 12.7 (החליקו) and the noun **חלקות** in 1QH^a 12.10, again associated with such designations as מליצי כזב (12.7), מליצי רמיה (12.9-10) and חוזי רמיה (12.10). The noun **חלקות** (without **דרש**) likewise appears in 4Q184 (frag.1, 17; cf. Proverbs 2.16; 5.3; 6.24; 7.5, 21) and 4Q185 (frags 1-2, 2.14), the former associated with attempts to lead astray the ‘elect of righteousness’ (בחירי צדק; 4Q184 frag.1, 14; cf. 1QH^a 10.13; 4Q215a frag.1, 2.2).

²⁰ See Chapter Three for a complete list.

²¹ See further n.19 above.

‘illusions’ (found in CD 1.18), are attested; instead we have simply the isolated accusation of seeking ‘smooth things’. Crucially it would appear therefore to have been removed from its original scriptural context and consequently highlighted as an individual charge. Rather than an explicit dependence upon Isaiah 30.9-11 (as is seemingly the case in CD 1.18-19a), this appears rather, given its association of דורשי חלקות with a ‘congregation’, to be dependent upon the pre-Yahadic text of the Damascus Document itself. These attestations in the ESL arguably therefore indicate a degree of de-contextualisation from the original scriptural passage and a subsequent partial-adoption of the phrase (complete with new connotations) within the sectarian tradition.²²

5.2.2.3. The Late Sectarian Layer

The Late Sectarian Layer contains no less than eight occurrences of the combination דרש and חלק across three texts (4Q163, 4Q169 and 4Q177). Each of these consistently attests the definite construct form דורשי החלקות. For example, 4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa^c) states in relation to Isaiah 30.15-18:²³

Frag.23, 2.10¹⁰ The interpretation of the word for the end of days concerns the congregation of the S[eekers of] Smooth Things {דורשי החלקות} ¹¹who are in Jerusalem. (4Q163 frag.23, 2.10-11)

Similarly, 4Q169 (4QpNah) refers six times to ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’.²⁴ To give just two examples, in quoting Nahum 3.1 it states:

²² Given this apparent acquisition of new connotations (e.g. עדה), it is perhaps worth noting that the designations מליצי תעוה (1QH^a 10.14) and מליצי כזב (10.31) interestingly combine root forms (ליץ; תעה; כזב) found in the (new) context of those who ‘sought smooth things’ in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (CD 1.11b-18a).

²³ Unfortunately we can only speculate as to what the pesher on Isaiah 30.10 may have been, though this interpretation of vv.15-18 would strongly suggest that it contained reference to דורשי החלקות.

²⁴ 4Q169 frags 3-4, 1.2; 1.7; 2.2; 2.4; 3.3; 3.6-7. Maurya Horgan also suggests reconstructing עדה דורשי החלקות in the lacuna at frags 1-2, 7, though this cannot be substantiated (1979, pp.162, 170).

Frgs 3-4, 2.1²“Woe the city of bloodshed, all of it [deceit,] full of [plund]er.” ²Its interpretation, it is the city of Ephraim, the Seekers of Smooth Things {דורשי החלקות} at the end of days who walk in deceit and falsehood[s]. (4Q169 frags 3-4, 2.1b-2)

Likewise it asserts with regard to Nahum 3.1-3:

Frgs 3-4, 2.4³Its interpretation concerns the dominion of the Seekers of Smooth Things {דורשי החלקות}, ⁵from the midst of whose congregation the sword of the nations will not be lacking. (4Q169 frags 3-4, 2.4b-5a)

In similar manner a rather fragmentary passage from 4Q177 (4QCatena A) preserves:

They are the congregation of the Seekers of [Smoo]th Things {דורשי החלקות} (4Q177 2.12)

The association of this label with a ‘congregation’ (עדה), observed in the ESL (1QH^a 10.32) and seemingly drawn from the FSL (cf. CD 1.12; 2.1), is continued with surprising uniformity in the LSL (4Q163 frag.23, 2.10; 4Q169 frags 3-4, 2.4-5; 4Q177 2.12). The new connotation (absent from Isaiah 30.9-11) has clearly stuck.

A number of descriptive features in this layer further suggest that in the LSL the דורשי החלקות were (on a literary level) implicitly identified with the followers of מטיף הכזב (1QpHab 10.9; 10.17 – 11.1[?]; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 4).²⁵ They are accused of leading astray (העיה; 4Q169 frags 3-4, 2.8; 3.5, 7), associated with lies, deceit and falsehood (4Q169 frags 3-4, 2.2, 8) and mentioned with regard to ‘the city of bloodshed’ of Nahum 3.1 (4Q169 frags 3-4, 2.1b-2). In 1QpHab 10.5b-13, ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ is identified with the one ‘who builds a city with bloodshed’ (Habakkuk 2.12) and is accused of having ‘led many astray’ (1QpHab 10.9; cf. 4Q169 frags 3-4, 2.8) and establishing ‘a congregation in falsehood’ (עדה בשקר; 1QpHab 10.10). Furthermore, the

²⁵ See also Callaway 1988, pp.158-159.

reference to **עדת דנורשין החלקות אשר בירושלים** (4Q163 frag.23, 2.10-11) recalls **עדת אנשי הלצון אשר בירושלים** in 4Q162 (2.10; cf. 2.6-7). Our analysis would suggest that the foundation for this implicit association with **מטיף** and **הכזב** in the LSL was the Yahadic redaction of CD 1.11b – 2.1 in the ESL, identifying the ‘congregation of traitors’ who ‘sought smooth things’ with the followers of **איש הלצון** (who ‘spouted to Israel waters of a lie’; 1.14-15).

Thus a suitable provenance for the various connotations associated with the sobriquet **החלקות דנורשין** in the LSL can be found in the ESL.²⁶ No discernible trace of the scriptural context (Isaiah 30.9-11) remains and instead these attestations, all with the definite article and performing a seemingly titular function for a specific group (cf. 4Q169 frags 3-4, 1.1b-4a), indicate an adoption of the phrase as a discrete element of sectarian terminology.

The sobriquet ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’ (**החלקות דנורשין**) exhibits the same developmental process observed with regard to **מטיף** and **מורה הצדק** and **הכזב**. In essence this involves a move from an indefinite scripturally-grounded description to a definite titular form, explicable by reference to an expanding web of inter-related texts and root forms that implicitly or explicitly influence the employment and development of the epithet.²⁷

²⁶ Writing of the relationship between the Hodayot and the pesharim, Davies likewise suggests that “the phrase **החלקות דנורשין** has been borrowed from the Hymns in order to coin a sobriquet” (1987, p.101). So too Bengtsson 2000a, p.120.

²⁷ This may indicate that at different stages in its development the accusation of seeking ‘smooth things’ was applied to different (historical?) groups who are ideologically lined-up with their ‘predecessors’. For example, ‘a congregation of traitors’ are described as having ‘sought smooth things’ in the FSL (CD 1.11b – 2.1) but the Yahadic redaction of the passage (postdating the split from the wider movement responsible for the original text) identifies the **עדת בוגדים** with the Yahad’s erstwhile companions. Anselm Hagedorn notes with regard to ‘otherness’ that when the ‘reference group’ changes, “it is possible to transfer set stereotypes to a new entity” (2005, p.234). Furthermore it has been suggested that **החלקות דנורשין** is a deliberate pun on **הלכה** (Brownlee 1951, pp.59-60). While it is conceivable that Isaiah 30.9-11 was alluded to for just this reason in the pre-Yahadic text of CD 1.18-19a, our analysis provides a sound account of the sobriquet’s development and function on literary grounds without resort to this assumption. Of course, this is not to deny that the label may retrospectively have been understood in a punning capacity.

5.2.3. Sobriquets across the Scrolls

In examining the development of מִטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב and מוֹרֵה הַצְדֵּק, and more briefly דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת, we have noted a process by which scriptural terminology is employed descriptively (in order to identify an individual or group, positively or negatively, with a scripturally-grounded typology) though may subsequently be isolated so as to perform a titular function. In so doing, the designations become increasingly prototypical; the implied referents are made personifications of these qualities.²⁸ The *core* of this process with regard to these three sobriquets can be sketched thus:²⁹

	<i>'The Teacher of Righteousness'</i>	<i>'The Spouter of the Lie'</i>	<i>'The Seekers of Smooth Things'</i>
FSL	'one who will teach righteousness' יֹרֵה הַצְדֵּק [cf. Hosea 10.12]		'they sought smooth things' דָּרְשׁוּ בַחֲלָקוֹת [cf. Isaiah 30.10]
ESL	'a teacher of righteousness' מוֹרֵה צֶדֶק	'a spouter of a lie' מִטִּיף כֹּזֵב [cf. Micah 2.11]	'seekers of smooth things' דּוֹרְשֵׁי חֲלָקוֹת
LSL	'the Teacher of Righteousness' מוֹרֵה הַצְדֵּק	'the Spouter of the Lie' מִטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב	'the Seekers of Smooth Things' דּוֹרְשֵׁי הַחֲלָקוֹת

Ida Fröhlich (speaking specifically of the 'spouter' designations) suggests that attestations in the Damascus Document (ESL):

²⁸ See initially Jokiranta 2005b.

²⁹ Ignoring for now the various related designations which have further fed into (or resulted from) this process (e.g. מוֹרֵה / יֹרֵה הַיָּחִיד; מְשִׁיחַ הַצְדֵּק; מִטִּיף הַכֹּזֵב; אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן; אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב; מַלְיָצֵי כֹזֵב).

can be considered as antecedent forms of the surname used in the pesharim. (Fröhlich 1999, p.300, n.33)³⁰

Bengtsson likewise notes that:

the Damascus Document thus contains many concepts and expression [sic] appearing in a more definite form in the Pesharim. (Bengtsson 2000a, p.95)

The same phenomenon has been observed of the Hodayot's influence upon the terminology and sobriquets of the LSL (see Davies 1987, pp.97-105). In addition to the indefinite form חלקות דורשי (1QH^a 10.15, 32), it also attests the label 'men of truth' (אנשי אמת; 1QH^a 6.2; 10.14) yet we find 'the Men of Truth' in the LSL (אנשי האמת; 1QpHab 7.10).³¹

In spite of this apparent developmental template, it is clear that, while the above sobriquets share an 'evolutionary timetable', these stages are not intrinsic to a given sectarian layer. We find definite forms not only in the LSL but also in the ESL (e.g. CD 1.14: איש הלצון; 20.1: מורה היחיד; 20.11: אנשי הלצון; 20.14: משיח; 20.15: איש הכזב; 20.32: אנשי היחיד; 4Q252 5.3: משיח; 5.5: אנשי היחיד) and even the FSL (e.g. CD 6.7: דורש התורה). Thus we cannot say that titular sobriquets in general were a late sectarian development, even if some of the better known appear only in the LSL (e.g. מורה הצדק; הכוהן הרשע; דורשי החלקות; מטף הכזב). We can however note that, where we do have evidence for variant forms or a scriptural origin, the direction of change is consistently towards a definite titular form. We can only speculate as to the origin of those sobriquets for which this evidence is lacking; they may either have undergone a similar developmental process (whether or not this was ever reflected in the texts) or perhaps appeared without discernible antecedent

³⁰ See further, Fröhlich 1996, pp.155 (n.6), 161 (n.20).

³¹ Note similarly אנשי רמיה (1QH^a 6.14; 10.16) and אנשי הרמיה (1QS 9.8). We have not in this examination undertaken an analysis of the S-material or assigned it to any textual layer; a synthesis incorporating other blocks of sectarian material is therefore to be desired.

forms (e.g. **הַכֹּהֵן הַרְשֵׁעַ**). In either case the trend we have observed holds true for all instances in which variant forms *can* be found to exist.³²

5.2.4. The Problems with this Model

We should at this juncture address some of the potential criticisms of our developmental model. Firstly, in the course of our investigation, 4Q252 (allotted to the ESL) was shown to be somewhat anomalous. It was examined on account of the designation **מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק** (4Q252 5.3) and the obvious similarities with **מֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק**. However, despite distinct terminological and contextual affinities, it could not easily be incorporated within our otherwise rather linear development of the sobriquet. On the one hand, this may raise questions about the overall accuracy of our model, though on the other it should be acknowledged that the issue of messianic expectation within the scrolls is a complex one displaying a diversity that is yet to be adequately reconciled.³³ Nevertheless, Davies is surely right to recognise the role of ‘cognitive dissonance’ in this respect (1985, p.42; 1988, p.317; cf. Rodd 1981). Our tentative proposal that the construction **מְשִׁיחַ הַצֶּדֶק** may reflect an amended (post-teacher) expectation, drawing not only upon Jeremiah 23.5 and 33.15 but also upon the terminology already in place to describe the messianic role (e.g. **יֹרֶה הַצֶּדֶק**; CD 6.11; cf. 12.23 – 13.1), might yet provide a suitable context for this designation within our model. In terms of future study, it may prove fruitful to examine the specific theme of messianic expectation against the backdrop of the chronological schema and process of sobriquet development advocated here.³⁴

More seriously, questions can be raised regarding our textual layering. What, for example, would happen if we were to adopt a different chronological schema? Furthermore, our establishment of a Formative Sectarian Layer was

³² Though cf. 1QS 6.6 and 8.11-12, to be discussed below.

³³ Collins 1995a (esp. pp.77-83); García Martínez 1995b; VanderKam 1994b. Cf. Smith 1959.

³⁴ See further our comments in Chapters Two and Three regarding **מְשִׁיחַ אֱהֶרֶן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל** (CD 12.23 – 13.1; 19.10-11) and **מְשִׁיחַ מֵאֱהֶרֶן וּמִיִּשְׂרָאֵל** (CD 20.1).

based upon the redaction history of the Damascus Document posited by Philip Davies (1983).³⁵ While others have argued similarly (see our discussion in Chapter One), Jonathan Campbell suggests that there is “no need to go down the interpolatory route” (1999, p.19).³⁶

how can it be, on the one hand, that an individual or group was happy to propagate the Damascus Document *in its extant form* and, on the other, that we apparently can detect all kinds of vestiges of earlier editions that undermine its status as a unified piece? (Campbell 1999, p.18; my italics)

If indeed the מורה צדק of the Yahadic Damascus Document was regarded as the anticipated יורה הצדק (CD 6.11) of the FSL, why did the latter (future-orientated) expectation remain in the Yahadic text?³⁷

John Barton argues that ‘in ancient times’ scriptural texts were read “with an assumption of coherence” (1986, p.145) and not necessarily as a “unitary whole” (p.150).³⁸ With regard to the Qumran-related sectarian material, Sarianna Metso likewise suggests that we should “focus on individual redactional units rather than on complete documents as if they were literary unities” (2004, pp.330-331). For example, the *redaction* of the Damascus Document by the Yahad would not necessarily entail the deletion of all parts no longer directly relevant. Accordingly:

one group formulated the material, which presumably matched the activity of that group. When a different group borrowed that material because they thought it was valuable, *it is not necessary to conclude that the new group acted out every detail of the passage*; thus it would be misleading to make the direct connection between that group’s texts and its historical activity.

It is true that, when the community actually used a manuscript, it presumably functioned as a unified document, and the separate sections that comprised the document may have gained a new focus in the new context of the newly redacted document. *But there may well have been an understanding that certain parts were important and their details corresponded with the activities of the group, but that other parts were less so*

³⁵ Cf. Collins 1985.

³⁶ Also, Campbell 1995a, pp.90 (n.71), 205-206; Dimant 1984, pp.495-497; Knibb 1994b, pp.155-158. See Rendtorff 1988, p.300.

³⁷ So Collins 1994a, p.194.

³⁸ See further, Rodd 1981, pp.102-103.

and those details had little or no correspondence to the historical activity of that group.
(Metso 2004, p.331; my italics)³⁹

Moreover, while the predominantly incompatible nature of the ‘teacher’ designations in the text is suggestive of a redactional history, there is at least a sense in which CD 6.10-11 may have continued to hold meaning for the movement. Given that the text was redacted *after* the death of the ‘teacher’ (cf. CD 19.33b – 20.1a; 20.13-15), in a period of reformulation of community expectation, when it came to it CD 6.10-11 may have been regarded as still relevant to the group’s (reformulated) eschatological hopes.⁴⁰

One further criticism of our developmental model is the fact that it is not demonstrable of all the sobriquets. In particular, ‘the Seeker of the Law’ is to be found in the form דורש התורה in the FSL (CD 6.7), ESL (CD 7.18) and LSL (4Q174 frag.1, 1.11; 4Q177 2.5). However, this does not contradict the direction towards a definite titular form taken by those epithets for which there is evidence of development. Indeed, as mentioned above, lack of evidence need not altogether preclude the possibility that other sobriquets underwent a similar developmental process. More difficult however is the fact that, while the title דורש התורה is given to a figure of the past in the FSL, it is assigned to an eschatological figure (perhaps to be identified with the Aaronic messiah) in the LSL (Brooke 1985, pp.202-205).⁴¹ Furthermore, 1QS refers in general terms to ‘a man seeking the law’ (איש דורש בתורה; 1QS 6.6; cf. 8.11-12), seemingly applicable to a plurality of ‘seekers’.⁴² How are we to account for this?

³⁹ Likewise, Grossman notes that: “the arguments presented in a text that receives ongoing use cannot be understood as static, unitary, or transparent. Although in its original setting a text may be intended to present a specific view, this in no way ensures that the text will be understood in terms of its original claims whenever it is read or interpreted” (2002, p.5). On the capacity for diverse readings of the Damascus Document, see Grossman 2002, pp.127-161.

⁴⁰ Cf. 4Q252 5.3?

⁴¹ We have already noted the possibility that CD 7.18 (ESL) likewise portrays the דורש התורה as a future figure; see Chapter Three, n.33 (also Brooke 1991a, pp.224-225).

⁴² Collins 1994a, p.194.

The latter problem may solve the first, as if the designation **דורש התורה** primarily indicated an ongoing activity within the community (as evidenced by 1QS 6.6-7) then we might well expect to find a more conspicuous re-usage of the epithet.⁴³ However the use of the seemingly indefinite description **איש דורש** **בתורה** in 1QS (almost certainly postdating the pre-Yahadic FSL), while contextually admissible in the light of the plurality of ‘seekers’ (i.e. *any דורש* **התורה** is here referred to), is ostensibly incongruent with our proposed developmental model. This may call into question once again our chronological layering of material or at least the veracity of the developmental process we have advocated. We might justifiably appeal on the grounds that the sobriquet **דורש התורה** is clearly a special case (with explicit provision for a plurality of ‘seekers’) and not representative of the other epithets we have witnessed.⁴⁴ Instead however we shall concede that, as Campbell notes with regard to scholarly hypotheses, “there can be no proof without some kind of external support” (1999, p.17). Therefore we shall turn our attention to sociological approaches, drawing specifically upon the sociology of deviance and ‘labelling theory’, in order to seek independent verification of these results.

5.3. The Qumran Sobriquets and the Sociology of Deviance

5.3.1. Sociological Approaches to the Scrolls

Sociological lines of enquiry, part of the wider field of social-scientific criticism, have a history of application to the study of religious belief.⁴⁵ The use of these approaches within biblical studies has been especially pervasive (Esler

⁴³ George Brooke even notes that the plural **מחוקקות** (CD 6.9), in the context of a/the past **דורש התורה** identified with **מחוקק** (6.7), “would suggest that there was a succession of Interpreters” (1985, p.200). See Fitzmyer 2000, p.99, n.78; Wise 1999, pp.202-209, 238-239.

⁴⁴ Might we observe here the apparent ‘democratisation’ of a title that was applied in the first instance to a prominent figure of the past?

⁴⁵ See initially, Goldthorpe 1974 (pp.183-204) and Macionis and Plummer 1998 (pp.502-528). Also the more detailed studies of Hill (1973) and Weber (1966).

2005; Robbins 1995; Rodd 1981).⁴⁶ In general we may note, in recent years, the production of several volumes devoted to the application of varying sociological models as a means by which we might better understand both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament as well as the social contexts that produced them.⁴⁷ More specifically we may highlight individual works which pursue lines of enquiry that may prove relevant to our own examination; in particular those concerning prophecy (Petersen 1991), sects and popular religious movements (A.I. Baumgarten 2005; Berlinerblau 1996; Blenkinsopp 1981; Elliott 1995; Malina 1995; Stark 1967; L.M. White 1988; Theissen 1978; cf. Chalcraft (ed.) 2007) and deviance and labelling (Barclay 1995; Lipp 1977; Malina and Neyrey 1993; Pietersen 1997; 2004; J.T. Sanders 1993).⁴⁸

Pierluigi Piovanelli suggests however that sociological approaches such as these are “conspicuously absent from the literature on the Qumran sectarian landscape” (2005, p.368).⁴⁹ While their use in the field of Qumran studies is certainly less extensive than in biblical studies, as perhaps reflects the relative youth of the discipline, nevertheless there are some notable exceptions and increasingly scholars have, implicitly or explicitly, begun to draw upon sociological models in order to facilitate our understanding of the scrolls. Early on, Johannes van der Ploeg noted the pertinence of a sociological understanding of sects to an examination of the Qumran-related movement (1958, pp.90-95). More recently, the volume entitled *New Directions in Qumran Studies* (Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005) serves as a good example of how a wide range of interdisciplinary methodologies, including the social-scientific, can and have been applied to Qumran scholarship. This and other similar studies have shed light upon such areas as the sectarianism behind the scrolls (Blenkinsopp 2005; Davies 1996, pp.163-177; 2005; Jokiranta 2001; Piovanelli 2005; Regev 2004; E.P.

⁴⁶ Note the following useful summaries: Elliott 1986; Esler 1995; Esler and Hagedorn 2005; Pietersen 2005, pp.166-167; Rogerson 1985.

⁴⁷ For example, Esler (ed.) 1995; 2005; Gunn and McNutt (eds) 2002; Neyrey (ed.) 1993; Simkins and Cook with Brenner (eds) 1999. Also, Elliott (ed.) 1986.

⁴⁸ See too the multifaceted work by Norman Gottwald (1979).

⁴⁹ Also Charlesworth 2002, p.6, n.10.

Sanders 2000; Stanton 1993; cf. Chalcraft (ed.) 2007) and messianism (Duhaime 2000a), utilising for example Weber typology and a sociology of millenarianism (Talmon 1989; 1991a; 1994a; 1994b; Wise 1999), study of relative deprivation (Duhaime 1993), social conflict models (Douglas 1999), spatial theory (Davies 2002; Lied 2005; Økland 2005), conversion theory (Brooke 2005b), social identity theory (Jokiranta 2005b; Lawrence 2005) and the sociology of deviance (Pietersen 2005). It is upon the latter approach that we shall now focus.

5.3.2. The Sociology of Deviance and Labelling Theory

The sociology of deviance is concerned with the behaviour of (and reaction to) “those individuals or groups which deviate from social norms” (Barclay 1995, p.114).⁵⁰ It thus addresses the processes by which we identify and define deviance, noting also its relevance to social control.⁵¹ Accordingly it may pertain to an examination of the community behind the scrolls, since, as Brooke notes:

the minority status of the Qumran group suggests that those who became members could well be considered by others, or have considered themselves, as deviating from normative Jewish behaviour in certain ways. (Brooke 2005b, p.73)⁵²

More crucially, evidence from the scrolls themselves (e.g. 4QMMT) would suggest that conversely the movement viewed the *rest* of Israel as deviant or in error (cf. CD 1.1-8a).⁵³ Thus we can speak of ‘positive’, as well as ‘negative’, deviance; the community behind the scrolls would have viewed in a positive light their deviance from ‘normative Jewish behaviour’ (so Pietersen 2005, p.171).

⁵⁰ A history of the discipline and its critics can be found in Sumner 1996.

⁵¹ The approach is outlined in the following: Becker 1973; Box 1971; Kelly (ed.) 1989; Macionis and Plummer 1998, pp.204-235; Rock 1973; Rock and McIntosh (eds) 1974; Schur 1980; Scott and Douglas (eds) 1972.

⁵² See further the comments by Stark (1967, p.174) and L.M. White (1988, p.14) on the deviant nature of sectarian movements. Also: Blenkinsopp 1981, pp.1-2; Goldthorpe 1974, pp.198-199; E.P. Sanders 2000, pp.42-43; Stanton 1993, p.90. Cf. Talmon 1994b, p.6.

⁵³ Goranson 1999.

Edwin Lemert (1989) distinguishes between primary and secondary deviation, the former concerned with the act of deviance itself and the latter with reactions to it. Secondary deviation focuses therefore on the interaction between ‘society’ and the deviant. This issue has been addressed by the ‘interactionist’ or ‘societal reaction’ perspective, known more commonly as ‘labelling theory’.⁵⁴ The classic expression of this is by Howard Becker:

social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an “offender.” The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label. (Becker 1973, p.9)

Deviance can accordingly be viewed as a social construct, the perception of which results in ‘negative labelling’ (Malina and Neyrey 1993, p.100).⁵⁵

Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey (1993) together identify three stages to the labelling process: (i) denunciation, (ii) retrospective interpretation, and (iii) status degradation ritual. The first of these reflects accusations of deviance made, for example, on account of behaviour perceived as such (e.g. ‘thief’, ‘murderer’, ‘heretic’). Accusations of this type may betray an implicit moral judgement. John Barclay notes in this respect the activity in 1 Corinthians of “Paul labelling as deviant those he considers should be excluded from the church” (1995, p.123). The result of this social distancing is that:

it becomes more and more possible to describe the deviant in impersonal and abstract terms. ... The consolidation of stereotypes can engender a punitive stance which allows the deviant less and less freedom to play anything but a deviant role. (Rock 1973, p.31)

⁵⁴ See primarily: Becker 1973; 1974; Schur 1971; Sumner 1996, pp.197-248. Becker has expressed his dislike of the broad term ‘labelling theory’, preferring ‘an interactionist theory of deviance’ (1973, p.181). Nevertheless for the sake of convenience, and having acknowledged the more specific terminology, it is the expression we shall continue to use.

⁵⁵ Critiques of this approach have further refined the issue: Box 1971, pp.11-15; Schur 1971, pp.13-23; 1980, pp.17-21; Scott and Douglas (eds) 1972, pp.37-116; Sumner 1996, pp.249-315. Cf. Barclay 1995, p.126, n.6; Becker 1973, pp.177-208; 1974; Pietersen 2005, pp.172-173.

Increased tension may in turn cause these accusations to become “more pronounced and hostile” (Hagedorn 2005, p.237).

The second stage of the labelling process involves the reinterpretation of past actions “in the light of this newly perceived deviant status” (Schur 1980, p.14). Through this process of retrospective interpretation, drawing selectively upon biographical information, it is demonstrated that the deviant was always thus.⁵⁶ As a result:

the deviant actor is made into a typical case of the thing the deviant is alleged to have done ... from crime perpetrator to “a criminal.” Behavior is fused with character, as the devious action and its actor become one in the deviant. (Malina and Neyrey 1993, p.106)

In this sense, and crucially for our purposes, “The deviance is personified so that the person can be depersonalized” (1993, p.106), a move aimed ultimately at ‘role engulfment’ and the attribution of ‘master status’. Consequently five criteria, if met, enable the widespread recognition of deviant status and are seen therefore to legitimise the label: (1) affirmation of responsibility; (2) affirmation of injury; (3) affirmation of the victim; (4) condemnation of the deviant; (5) appeal to authority.⁵⁷

Finally the status of the deviant is degraded by means of a ritual intended to stigmatize and engulf the accused in the deviant role.⁵⁸

the actor’s former identity is virtually destroyed and a totally new identity established, a *master status* which engulfs all others. (Malina and Neyrey 1993, p.107)

This ‘master status’ has an overriding quality which accordingly comes to define the deviant and is thus considered representative of the whole character.⁵⁹ One who steals is no longer simply *described* as ‘a thief’ but is formally labelled as such and subsequently regarded (primarily) in relation to this role. He is a

⁵⁶ Malina and Neyrey note that: “Positive information about the alleged deviant is left open to doubt or simply ignored” (1993, p.106). See further, Schur 1971, pp.52-56.

⁵⁷ Malina and Neyrey 1993, pp.105-107.

⁵⁸ See Garfinkel 1956.

⁵⁹ Becker 1973, pp.33-34; Schur 1980, pp.12-14.

personification of the deviant act and so “at the same time, exposed, prosecuted, and sentenced” (Lipp 1977, p.65). Barclay again reads 1 Corinthians 5 in this light:

Paul selects from this individual’s many activities the one feature of which he disapproves and makes that the defining character of his identity: this man does not just *indulge in some porneia*, he is a *pornos* and must be treated as that, whatever else he might also be in character or behaviour. (Barclay 1995, p.124)

Similarly we might consider the portrayal of Judas as ‘a thief’ in John 12.4-6, a master status which comes to define him and through which his past is retrospectively interpreted:⁶⁰

^{12.4}But Judas Iscariot, one of his disciples (the one who was about to betray him), said, ⁵‘Why was this perfume not sold for three hundred denarii and the money given to the poor?’ ⁶(He said this not because he cared about the poor, but because he was a thief; he kept the common purse and used to steal what was put into it.) (John 12.4-6)

Role engulfment and the attribution of master status, being by nature both overriding and personifying (while simultaneously depersonalising the one labelled), may thus advocate an appellative use of the deviant label. Paul Rock notes that we “impose increasingly anonymous and general characteristics on people ... as they become socially removed from us” (1973, p.29) and so the deviant is frequently referred to as ‘the thief’, ‘the addict’, ‘the murderer’.⁶¹ In the case of Judas, William Klassen observes that he:

is portrayed as the epitome of evil in the form of hypocrisy, greed, unfaithfulness, ingratitude, and, above all, betrayal. His name is equivalent to “traitor”. In many writings about him, *authors spare themselves the effort of using Judas’s name and refer to him mainly as “the traitor”*, implying thereby that his act of betrayal of Jesus is what made him stand out among the twelve apostles. (Klassen 1996, p.4; my italics)⁶²

⁶⁰ Cf. Pietersen 2005, p.174.

⁶¹ See: Becker 1973, pp.25-39; Malina and Neyrey 1993, p.106; Rock 1973, pp.33-34; Schur 1971, pp.69-81; 1980, pp.12-17, 146-150.

⁶² Also Malina and Neyrey 1993, p.101.

To give another, more contemporary example, we might note Peter Sutcliffe, more commonly known as ‘the Yorkshire Ripper’.⁶³ With the establishment of master status the labelling process is successfully completed and a new overarching role ascribed to the deviant.

Malina and Neyrey point out that deviant status can be resisted and accusations of deviance can be neutralised (1993, pp.108-110).⁶⁴ In this respect, five criteria are employed (the reverse of those listed above to enable the recognition of deviant status): (1) denial of responsibility; (2) denial of injury; (3) denial of the victim; (4) condemnation of condemners; (5) appeal to higher loyalties. Two further neutralisation techniques are noted by Lloyd Pietersen (2005, pp.170-171): (6) claim of benefits; (7) basking in the reflected glory of related others (BIRGing). The fourth of these, the condemnation of condemners, entails what Edwin Schur describes as ‘stigma contests’ (1980, p.8); in effect, “I am not a crook; you are the crooks” (J.T. Sanders 1993, p.144).⁶⁵ Inasmuch as the community behind the scrolls can be regarded as deviant, this insight may prove enlightening in the context of the group’s own deviantizing of those external to the community.

5.3.3. The Qumran Sobriquets and the Acquisition of Master Status

Robert Scott makes the following observation:

There are at least two features of a [negative] deviant label that make it distinctive; one is that it carries an imputation of moral inferiority and culpability, and the other, that it is an essentializing label. (Scott 1972, p.14)

⁶³ It should be acknowledged that acquisition of master status can similarly result in *positive* labels becoming appellative (Hagedorn 2005, p.231; Malina and Neyrey 1993, p.99). To use an example from nascent Christianity, we have only to note the appropriation of Jesus as ‘the Christ’, with regard to which Horbury observes “the development of the title towards the status of a proper name” (1998, p.142). Perhaps also we might consider the appellative use of ‘Augustus’ for the first Roman emperor, (previously known as) Octavian; see for example Boardman, Griffin and Murray (eds) 1991.

⁶⁴ See further: Lipp 1977, pp.65-67; J.T. Sanders 1993, pp.232-233; Schur 1971, pp.148-154.

⁶⁵ Also Becker 1973, pp.1-2.

These qualities are likewise true of the disparaging sobriquets found among the scrolls, such as ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ or ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’. The same essentialising quality, along with an assertion of moral *superiority*, is also demonstrable with regard to the positive epithets such as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ or ‘the Men of Truth’. Might the sociological model of labelling outlined above, in particular the insights concerning the acquisition of master status, shed light upon the developmental process witnessed of the Qumran-related sobriquets?⁶⁶

We have seen that the sobriquets are primarily evaluative in nature (Bengtsson 2000a, pp.38, 49-50; Brownlee 1979, pp.35-36; Harris 1966, pp.53-54; Jokiranta 2005a, pp.27-28). Moreover, our examination demonstrates a shift from a descriptive or indefinite use of these evaluative traits to an appellative one. Hence a figure is initially described as ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (CD 1.11; 20.32; drawing on CD 6.2-11a) and ultimately confirmed as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’, indicating a subsumption within the prescribed role. Similarly, one who is accused of spouting lies (CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26) is ultimately ascribed an appellative designation, ‘the Spouter of the Lie’, associating him intrinsically with his deviant behaviour. The final form of the sobriquets thus reflects a master status which is both definitive of the person so labelled and personifying of the evaluative trait. The designation ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’ is stereotypical of the accusations of Isaiah 30.9-11. The use of such terminology is indicative of role engulfment and governs all subsequent interpretation of character and actions (Schur 1980, pp.12-14).

⁶⁶ Cyril Rodd cautions against the application of sociological models to ancient documents, as the only available evidence is that which has survived by chance and thus the approach is “not likely to be fruitful” (1981, p.104). He does concede however the possibility of a heuristic employment. Similarly, Pietersen states that: “when we come to ancient texts ... we do not have any access to the ‘deviants’. We only have the point of view of those doing the labelling as embedded in the texts. Nevertheless, the value of labelling theory ... is precisely due to the fact that it begins with the assumption that no act is intrinsically deviant. Labelling theory thus draws attention to the significance of the labellers in the deviance defining process. This aspect can usefully be employed heuristically to ask fresh questions of the text” (2004, p.30). So too Philip Esler: “Models are heuristic tools, not ontological statements. Accordingly, they are either useful or not, and it is meaningless to ask whether they are ‘true’ or ‘false’” (1995, p.4).

In the first instance, Pietersen notes the use of four neutralisation techniques within the scrolls, aimed at resisting the accusations of deviance brought against the community (2005, pp.175-181): (i) condemnation of condemners; (ii) appeal to higher loyalties; (iii) claim of benefits; (iv) basking in the reflected glory of related others. Of these the first and fourth are most pertinent to our examination of the use and function of sobriquets in the texts. Significantly, Pietersen observes ‘the condemnation of condemners’ to be “the favourite strategy of the *pesharim*” (2005, p.179), indicating that other strategies might have been more prevalent in earlier textual layers.⁶⁷ That the use of labels in the scrolls may arise from such a neutralisation technique prompts him to state that:

in the case of Qumran, the process can best be described as ‘reverse labelling’ as the Qumran community seeks to define itself over and against the rest of society by deviantizing all those who are not members of the community. (Pietersen 2005, p.173)

Michael Wise similarly notes the use of reversal in the texts (for example, the Hodayot) and suggests that the various derogatory designations indicating false prophecy (e.g. חזוי רמיה; חזוי תעוה; נביאי כזב) imply that the ‘teacher’ was himself accused of such.⁶⁸ This is reminiscent of Schur’s concept of ‘stigma contests’ (1980, p.8; cf. J.T. Sanders 1993, p.144).

The effect of this neutralisation technique is the affirmation of the deviance of those external to the community. With regard to the labelling process engaged in by the group, the same three stages identified by Malina and Neyrey (‘denunciation’, ‘retrospective interpretation’ and ‘status degradation ritual’) can be witnessed. Initially those who are at odds with the group’s ideology are denounced on account of their deviant behaviour, drawing upon scriptural typologies where appropriate. In this light, the description of one who spouts lies

⁶⁷ See further, Pietersen 2005, pp.179-180.

⁶⁸ Wise 1999, pp.97-99. Note that Gershon Brin interprets 4Q375 as “a polemic against ... a spiritual leader, defined by Jerusalem as a seducer prophet, but whom the Sect evaluated positively” (1995, p.59).

(CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26) can be understood in relation to the positive attributes of ‘a teacher of righteousness’ (CD 1.11; 20.32):

the symbolic quality of the perpetrator and the trait are seen by witnesses as stark opposites of the counter symbolic figures available ... so much so that it only makes sense to condemn the perpetrator. Not to condemn him/her is to reject the opposite. (Malina and Neyrey 1993, p.105)⁶⁹

Likewise those who ‘sought smooth things’ (CD 1.18), borrowing imagery from Isaiah 30.9-11, are contrasted with those who sought God (CD 1.10). The denunciation of opponents in this manner is such that their deviant status is readily apparent.

Through a process of retrospective interpretation these opponents of the community are identified as having always fulfilled such a role. The followers of the ‘spouter’ are recognised to be the ‘congregation of traitors’ of CD 1.12, while in the *Hodayot* the labels given to opponents (e.g. 1QH^a 10.14: ‘mediators of error’; 12.10: ‘seers of deceit’; 12.16: ‘prophets of a lie’) indicate that they are viewed as *typifying the deviant behaviour of which they are accused*. Thus, just as Malina and Neyrey recognise the move “from crime perpetrator to ‘a criminal’” (1993, p.106), so here we see a shift from those who ‘sought smooth things’ (CD 1.18) to ‘seekers of smooth things’ (1QH^a 10.15, 32).

Finally, a status degradation ritual takes place. In his examination of the concept, Harold Garfinkel asserts that:

Any communicative work between persons, whereby the public identity of an actor is transformed into something looked on as lower in the local scheme of social types, will be called a “status degradation ceremony”. (Garfinkel 1956, p.420; my italics)

In the Qumran-related material this ritual is a literary one, played out in the texts themselves.⁷⁰ The labelled opponents are imbued with a master status and are

⁶⁹ Also Garfinkel 1956, pp.422-423.

⁷⁰ To what degree a historical/physical ‘ceremony’ may be deemed to lie behind such a literary degradation ritual is not clearly evidenced by the texts (though note, for example, 1QpHab 5.8-12 according to the interpretation of Brownlee (1979, pp.91-95), Carmignac (1962a, pp.507-510) and Lim (2005); see Chapter Four, n.13). On status degradation within texts, see further Garfinkel 1956. Pietersen likewise views the Pastoral Epistles as attesting “a literary version of a status

engulfed in the deviant role; their public identity is transformed and their social status degraded. The deviant is depersonalised and the label comes to define the character, the result of which is that in the final analysis:

the enemies of the Community were, to them, not historical people or peoples, but the actual personifications of their biblical prototypes. (B.J. Roberts 1968, pp.198-199)

Derived from these scriptural typologies we accordingly find the stereotypical, role-personifying designations such as ‘the Spouter of the Lie’ (1QpHab 10.9; 10.17 – 11.1[?]; 1Q14 frags 8-10, 4), ‘the Men of Scoffing’ (CD 20.11; 4Q162 2.6; 2.10; 4Q177 1.7[?]) and ‘the Seekers of Smooth Things’ (4Q163 frag.23, 2.10; 4Q169 frags 3-4, 1.2; 1.7; 2.2; 2.4; 3.3; 3.6-7; 4Q177 2.12). These not only serve an appellative function but one that is intrinsically evaluative and definitive.⁷¹

In addition to negative labelling we find positive affirmations of role and identity in the scrolls. These perform a similar function inasmuch as they confirm the social distancing between the community and those they perceive to be deviant.⁷² The process of negative labelling already witnessed:

naturally involves two-way stereotyping, since every image we create of the other is tied – subconsciously – to a stereotypic image of ourselves. (Hagedorn 2005, p.233)

Harold Garfinkel, in relation to the practice of status degradation, likewise states that:

The witness must appreciate the characteristics of the typed person and event by *referring the type to a dialectical counterpart*. Ideally, the witnesses should not be able to contemplate the features of the denounced person without reference to the

degradation ceremony” (2004, p.110; cf. pp.31-33; 110-111). This difference in medium may also explain why, with regard to the Qumran-related sobriquets (as we find them within the scrolls at least), the acquisition of master status does not occur ‘overnight’. As Garfinkel notes: “Face-to-face contact is a different situation from that wherein the denunciation and reply are conducted by radio and newspaper” (1956, p.424; cf. Nielsen 1961, pp.32-38). The speed of the process can likewise be affected by other factors such as social distance (Rock 1973, p.29).

⁷¹ See Pietersen 2005, pp.176-177.

⁷² William Schniedewind suggests that the community “used language ideologically as a means of differentiating and further insulating themselves” (1999a, p.235).

counterconception, as *the profanity of an occurrence or a desire or a character trait, for example, is clarified by the references it bears to its opposite, the sacred*. (Garfinkel 1956, pp.422-423; my italics)

Thus the affirmation of positive ideals goes hand-in-hand with the denunciation of negative deviance. As Fröhlich notes, “The definition of ‘the other’ is possible in the light of their self-definition, the definition of ‘we’” (2004, p.1). Sobriquets such as ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’ or ‘the Men of Truth’ exhibit an acquired master status (e.g. ‘one who will teach righteousness’ – ‘a teacher of righteousness’ – ‘the Teacher of Righteousness’) and are presented as both archetypal and personifying of the positive qualities by which the negative might be better known.⁷³

It is notable that “Such rhetoric betrays a rigid dualism of insiders and outsiders” (Anderson 2005a, p.354), thereby lending itself to the intricacies of social control:⁷⁴

denouncement speech can be used as a means of propaganda to marginalize outsiders while exercising control over the behavior of insiders. (Anderson 2005a, p.354)⁷⁵

Through the identification of deviants, the symbolic and moral boundaries of the group are reaffirmed, solidifying community identity and serving as a warning to *potential* deviants.⁷⁶ The role-engulfing labels, having acquired a master status:

create a dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked, and thus call for identification with the right side, the right group. (Jokiranta 2005b, p.256)

One strength of the labels’ stereotypical nature is that it allows for transferable application (see Hagedorn 2005, pp.234, 238-239). As Bengtsson puts it, “New opponents could also have been disparaged by old designations” (2000a, p.297).⁷⁷

⁷³ So too Jokiranta 2005b, p.257; cf. Callaway 1994, pp.417-418.

⁷⁴ Rock 1973, p.66. Cf. Rock and McIntosh (eds) 1974.

⁷⁵ Cf. Mason 1997.

⁷⁶ See primarily Erikson 1989. Also: Barclay 1995, pp.117-118, 123-125; Davies 2002, p.88; Scott 1972, p.10. Note in this context, CD 20.8b-13 and 1QpHab 2.1-10a.

⁷⁷ See van der Woude 1982.

In terms of social control and boundary maintenance, the master status acquired by the deviant labels provides:

an example of how to handle covenant members who refuse to stay within their proper bounds. In the language of these texts, anyone who leaves the community – whether in its present state or in the distant past – is, in fact, a follower after ‘the Man of the Lie.’ (Grossman 2002, p.157)⁷⁸

The use of the Qumran-related sobriquets in this fashion, and their development as noted in previous chapters, accords with the sociological model of ‘labelling theory’ and the development of master status. A sociology of deviance approach can therefore be seen to perhaps shed light upon the function and employment of the sobriquets and lend weight to our findings above.

5.4. Conclusions

Our examination of the sobriquets *מטִּיף הכּוֹז* and *מורה הצדק* (along with *דורשי החלקות*) has uncovered a complex process by which these labels were formulated and subsequently employed. In their earliest forms they draw primarily upon scripture in order to perform an evaluative, descriptive function grounded in this shared tradition.⁷⁹ Increasingly however they become prototypical designations such that any historical referent to the label is engulfed within the prescribed role. In this sense the sobriquet itself, as personified typology, becomes its own character within the text, overshadowing that of any historical referent it may once have had.⁸⁰ Accordingly:

the presentation of various persons and groups in Qumran *pesharim* is determined not so much by the historical reality as by literary stereotypes. (Fröhlich 1996, p.159, n.11)

This allows Jutta Jokiranta to comment that, despite references to his death in the ESL (CD 19.33b – 20.1a; 20.13-15), in the *pesharim* the ‘teacher’ *could* be

⁷⁸ So too Bengtsson 2000a, p.109.

⁷⁹ See Fröhlich 1999, p.305; Jokiranta 2005a, pp.24-25.

⁸⁰ Hence perhaps the problems encountered with attempts to identify the referents of the sobriquets; see Chapter One.

construed as a contemporary figure.⁸¹ More particularly our examination has focussed on the process by which this shift is achieved, noting the specific form and context of employment across our three sectarian textual layers. As a result we have witnessed a developmental tendency from an indefinite, scripturally-grounded descriptive function towards a definite titular form.

A comparison with the insights to be garnered from a sociology of deviance perspective, drawing in particular upon labelling theory, has engendered a fruitful fresh approach to the labelling processes within the scrolls.⁸² The sociological labelling of deviants and affirmation of positive counterparts bears great resemblance to our findings concerning the Qumran-related sobriquets. The process of denunciation, retrospective interpretation and status degradation can be demonstrated, as well as the presence of neutralisation techniques where relevant. Moreover the move towards role engulfment, and thus the acquisition of master status, provides a suitable backdrop to the developmental process witnessed with regard to the sobriquets. While this sociological model is a 'heuristic tool', and so "yields insight rather than necessarily embodying truth" (Esler 1995, p.7), it does provide us with a lens through which we might better understand the sobriquets and lends weight to our own observations regarding their developing function across the textual layers (and thus by implication our chronological schema). Consequently we can now perceive this development as one from indefinite, scripturally-grounded accusations of deviance (denunciation) towards a definite prototypical and appellative form denoting role engulfment and the personification of the deviant act (master status). By the same measure, the positive designations, through their acquisition of master status, represent "the maximum *difference* to the out-groups" (Jokiranta 2005b, p.257); this enables boundary affirmation and the successful completion of the labelling process,

⁸¹ Jokiranta 2005b, pp.262-263.

⁸² The groundwork for which has been laid by Pietersen (2005). James Charlesworth likewise notes that: "It is imperative to comprehend the sociological dimensions of knowledge and language developed within the Community. One might miss some dimensions of Qumran history and sociology by seeking to discern the identities of those named only by sobriquets" (2002, p.72).

CHAPTER FIVE: The Development of the Qumran Sobriquets

identifying as deviant all those external to the group and so reaffirming community identity.

Conclusions

We began this investigation with the recognition of 'standard' forms among the sobriquets, those forms found most frequently among the texts themselves and/or cited most commonly in the secondary literature (e.g. מורה; דורשי החלקות; מטף הכזב; הצדק). We also noted the existence of alternative forms (e.g. מורה צדק), often regarded as variants of no real consequence.¹ We hypothesised that, given the traditionally allotted time-span for sectarian composition and evidence for ideological development attested by the texts, the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process, changing in form and perhaps meaning and/or referent. We further speculated that this process might be evidenced within the scrolls themselves if examined in a manner sensitive to the varied composition dates of the texts and with particular reference to the specific forms taken by the sobriquets where they appear.

Concentrating our investigation on the labels מטף and מורה הצדק, הכזב, and adopting a chronological schema that posited a Formative, Early and Late Sectarian Layer, we proceeded to examine the various sobriquet occurrences across the sectarian texts.² In addition to fascinating insights regarding the development of terminological and contextual connotations governing both the employment of the designations and the direction taken by the passages in which they are set (see Chapter Five, n.12), we also noted a more general evolutionary trend towards a definite ('standard') form, with the so-called variants representing earlier stages in this process. The same development, ostensibly from scriptural reference to sectarian terminology, was similarly demonstrated with regard to the sobriquet דורשי החלקות in Chapter Five.

¹ So, for example, Lim 2002, p.75.

² FSL: (Pre-Yahadic) D-material; ESL: (Yahadic) D-material and H-material; LSL: P-material.

We further augmented our study by utilising the insights of a sociology of deviance approach, drawing heavily upon 'labelling theory', in order to investigate the compliance of our findings with research carried out in another academic field. The use of this model proved to be fruitful, providing a template for such a move towards definite or appellative labels and thus some explanation for the process witnessed within the scrolls. Viewed from a sociological perspective the Qumran-related sobriquets function as tools for labelling deviance and affirming positive counterparts. As a result, we can propose with some confidence that the move from indefinite designations (e.g. 'a teacher of righteousness') to definite ones ('the Teacher of Righteousness') reflects a process of role engulfment geared towards the personification of the quality and the acquisition of 'master status'.³

Our investigation has a number of implications and above all promotes the need for a heightened sensitivity regarding the unique and/or inter-related nature of individual texts and the designations found therein.⁴ It can no longer be assumed uncritically that different forms of the sobriquets are merely insignificant variants. Instead our approach has uncovered the intricacies of a developmental process, the broad contours of which find both support and explanation within the sociology of deviance and labelling theory. The acknowledgement of such development entails a recognition that, in the course of this process, these labels may have altered in terms of associated connotations and/or referent. Certainly it is to be conceded that the stereotypical nature of the 'standard' form sobriquets denoting master status (coupled with the inherent depersonalisation of the individual labelled) lends itself to reapplication.⁵ Furthermore such reinterpretation of the referent might not be restricted to the

³ In this context we might note by way of interest a potentially similar phenomenon with regard to various of the New Testament titles applied to Jesus. Ferdinand Hahn (1969) argues for a conceptual development of these labels towards definite, more specific forms. As summarised by Geza Vermes: "the vocative 'lord!' paved the way to the absolute designation, '*the* lord', in the same way that the appellation 'rabbi!/teacher!' led to the definition of Jesus as '*the* teacher'" (2001, p.86; see further pp.64-194). Note also Horbury 1998, pp.140-150. Cf. Chapter Five, n.63.

⁴ See Davies 1985, p.48.

⁵ Note the multiple wicked priests of the Groningen Hypothesis (e.g. van der Woude 1982).

texts alone; while the Peshar on Habakkuk may have intended to refer to a specific, individual ‘Wicked Priest’, the stereotypical (and anonymous) nature of the designation would allow readers to ‘identify’ later figures within the text.⁶ Moreover, the web of scriptural and sectarian material drawn upon, along with the not-always-consistent employment of relevant terminology, allows the reader scope to perceive (to a varying degree from text to text) different sobriquets as either synonymous or distinct. This was demonstrated most clearly with regard to *מַטִּיף הַכּוֹז*, *אִישׁ הַכּוֹז* and *אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן*. Thus we may speak of an evolution of ‘perceived history’ within the group, the results of which are displayed most prominently in the later texts (e.g. the pesharim) though the phenomenon itself would continue with the response of readers to this material. Accordingly, the problems other scholars have noted with a ‘naïve historicism’ (see Chapter One) are confirmed in detail here. Serious questions are raised about the reliability of historical/biographical information in the scrolls and hence concerning those approaches to the sobriquets which seek primarily to identify historical referents behind them.

While we have addressed a number of issues with regard to our understanding of the Qumran-related sobriquets, we have nevertheless generated many more questions that must for the moment remain unanswered but which may prove fertile avenues for future investigation or refinement. For example, while labelling theory ostensibly supports the internal coherence of our chronological schema, it would be interesting to consider what effect a different construal of the textual layers might have upon our reading of the sobriquets. Can an equally convincing case be made for an alternative reconstruction? In addition, can we further refine our own schema? If, for instance, we accept the commonly held view that the ‘Teacher Hymns’ were indeed composed by the ‘teacher’ (e.g. Douglas 1999), then we may be able to further divide the ESL on the grounds that the death of this figure appears in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus

⁶ So too Bengtsson 2000a, pp.41-42.

Document (accordingly, ESL-1: H-material; ESL-2: Yahadic D-material).⁷ Thus the accusations of lying (e.g. **אִישׁ הַכֹּזֵב**; **מַטִּיף כֹּזֵב**) and scoffing (**אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן**; **אִישׁ הַלְצוֹן**) in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document may be dependent upon the less specific references to liars and scoffers in the H-material.⁸

Furthermore, consideration should be given as to where in our chronological schema we might place other texts such as 4Q174, 4Q175 or 4Q253a and, more generally, M- and S-material.⁹ The ‘anomalous’ designations we have encountered, such as **מִשִּׁיחַ הַצִּדֵּק** (4Q252 5.3) and **מִוֶּרֶה יְצִדְקָה** (1QpHab 2.2), also need to be convincingly synthesised within our developmental model; while explanations have been offered no entirely satisfactory solution to their presence has yet been found. Indeed a thorough investigation of *all* the sobriquets in the scrolls along the lines proposed here is desirable (including perhaps the use of such designations as **מִבְּקָר** and **דּוֹרֵשׁ**).¹⁰ In particular, further examination is required of the label **מִוֶּרֶה** and its relationship with **הַתּוֹרָה**.¹¹

We have in this present study really only scratched the surface, but nevertheless have hopefully paved the way for future critical examinations of the Qumran-related sobriquets. We have demonstrated the *development* of these

⁷ See, for example, Stegemann 1998 (pp.107, 116-118) and Steudel 2000 (pp.338-339). Note our discussion of this position in Chapter One.

⁸ See Chapter Three, n.150.

⁹ 4Q253a (4QCommentary on Malachi) frag.1, 1.5 for instance, as observed in Chapter One (n.59), preserves **הַצִּדֵּק** [...]. George Brooke suggests this may either be restored **הַצִּדֵּק** [מִוֶּרֶה], as found in the pesharim, or **הַצִּדֵּק** [מַטִּיף] as found in 4Q252 5.3, one of the ‘Commentaries on Genesis’ with which this text was previously associated (Brooke 1995, pp.237-238; cf. 1996, pp.213-215; 2002). Our positioning of 4Q253a in either the ESL or LSL may consequently inform our reconstruction of this phrase (or vice-versa?).

¹⁰ Cf. Hempel 2006; Kosmala 1978c; Schiffman 1994, pp.121ff.; 2003, pp.422-423.

¹¹ Our examination of labelling theory and the acquisition of master status would appear to support our chronological schema and developmental model. Therefore, for the present, the occurrence of **אִישׁ דּוֹרֵשׁ בַּתּוֹרָה** in 1QS 6.6 (and the future orientation of **דּוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה** in 4Q174 frag.1, 1.11-12) can be attributed only to the apparent plural nature of the designation (see our discussion in Chapter Five).

labels and have proposed a potentially fruitful model for understanding both this specific process and the function played by the designations within the sectarian literature and worldview of the community. That there is a clear development of usage indicates that these texts, and in particular the sobriquets themselves, cannot be read indiscriminately as a homogeneous collection, even if deemed to be the product of a single group, but must be considered individually and in a manner sensitive to the shifting perspectives within the Qumran-related community.

Bibliography

Abegg, M.G., Jr.

- 1995 "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?", in *DSD* 2, pp.125-144.
- 1997 "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness", in C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint (eds), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.61-73.
- 1998 "The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.325-358.
- 2002 "Concordance of Proper Names in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran", in E. Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, DJD 39 (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.229-284.

Abegg, M.G., Jr., J.E. Bowley and E.M. Cook

- 2003 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*, Parts 1-2 (Leiden: Brill).

Allegro, J.M.

- 1956a "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature", in *JBL* 75, pp.174-187.
- 1956b "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect", in *JBL* 75, pp.89-95.
- 1968 *Qumran Cave 4, I (4Q158-4Q186)*, DJDJ 5 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- 1981 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (London: Abacus).

Allegro, J.M. with N. Gordon

- 2004a "4Q171 (4QpPs^a)", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.96-105.
- 2004b "4Q172 (4QpUnid)", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.140-143.
- 2004c "4Q173 (4QpPs^b)", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.104-105.

- Allegro, J.M. with M.O. Wise, M.G. Abegg Jr., E.M. Cook and N. Gordon
 2004a "4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa^c [pesher Isaiah (1)])", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.30-47.
 2004b "4Q165 (4QpIsa^c [pesher Isaiah (1)])", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.46-49.
 2004c "4Q177 (4QCatena A)", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.8-17.
 2004d "4Q169 (4QpNah)", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.72-79.
- Amit, Y.
 1990 "Hidden Polemic in the Conquest of Dan: Judges XVII-XVIII", in *VT* 40, pp.4-20.
- Anderson, J.S.
 2005a "From 'Communities of Texts' to Religious Communities: Problems and Pitfalls", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.351-355.
 2005b "Denouncement Speech in Jubilees and Other Enochic Literature", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.132-136.
- Applebaum, S.
 1989 *Judaea in Hellenistic and Roman Times: Historical and Archaeological Essays* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Atwill, J. and S. Braunheim with R. Eisenman
 2004 "Redating the Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *DSD* 11, pp.143-157.
- Avigad, N.
 1958 "The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents", in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (eds), *Scripta Hierosolymitana: Publications of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Volume IV, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press), pp.56-87.
- Barclay, J.M.G.
 1995 "Deviance and Apostasy: Some Applications of Deviance Theory to First-Century Judaism and Christianity", in P.F. Esler (ed.),

Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context (London: Routledge), pp.114-127.

Bartholomew, C., C.S. Evans, M. Healy and M. Rae (eds)

2003 *"Behind" the Text: History and Biblical Interpretation*, SHS Vol.4 (Carlisle: Paternoster Press).

Barton, J.

1986 *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).

1996 *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).

Barton, J. and J. Muddiman (eds)

2001 *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Baumgarten, A.I.

2000 "The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document", in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery – Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998* (Leiden: Brill), pp.1-15.

2004 "Who Cares and Why Does it Matter? Qumran and the Essenes, Once Again!", in *DSD* 11, pp.174-190.

2005 *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Baumgarten, J.M.

1979 "The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of Šedeq in Jewish Apocalyptic", in *ANRW*, II 19.1, pp.219-239.

1996 *Qumran Cave 4, XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)*, DJD 18 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

1999 "Yom Kippur in the Qumran Scrolls and Second Temple Sources", in *DSD* 6, pp.184-191.

2000 "Damascus Document", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.166-170.

2004 "Damascus Document (D)" [4Q266-73; 4Q269 with H. Stegemann], in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law* (Leiden: Brill), pp.79-175.

Baumgarten, J.M and D.R. Schwartz

1995 "Damascus Document (CD)", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with*

English Translations: Vol.2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.4-57.

Beall, T.S.

- 1988 *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Becker, H.S.

- 1973 *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: The Free Press).
- 1974 "Labelling Theory Reconsidered", in P. Rock and M. McIntosh (eds), *Deviance and Social Control* (London: Tavistock Publications), pp.41-66.

Bengtsson, H.

- 2000a *What's in a Name? A Study of Sobriquets in the Pesharim* (Uppsala: Uppsala University).
- 2000b "Three Sobriquets, Their Meaning and Function: The Wicked Priest, Synagogue of Satan, and the Woman Jezebel", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* (Richland Hills: BIBAL Press), pp.241-273.

Berlinerblau, J.

- 1996 *The Vow and the 'Popular Religious Groups' of Ancient Israel: A Philological and Sociological Inquiry* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Bernstein, M.J.

- 1994a "4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary", in *JJS* 45, pp.1-27.
- 1994b "4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke", in *JQR* 85, pp.61-79.
- 2000a "Interpretation of Scripture", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.376-383.
- 2000b "Peshar Habakkuk", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.647-650.

Berrin, S.L.

- 2000a "Lemma/Peshar Correspondence in Peshar Nahum", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the*

- Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.341-350.
- 2000b "Pesharim", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.644-647.
- 2004a "The Use of Secondary Biblical Sources in Peshar Nahum", in *DSD* 11, pp.1-11.
- 2004b *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (Leiden: Brill).
- 2005 "Qumran Pesharim", in M. Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.110-133.
- Birnbaum, S.A.
- 1951 "How Old are the Cave Manuscripts? A Palaeographical Discussion", in *VT* 1, pp.91-109.
- Blasi, A.J.
- 1997 "Sociology of Early Christianity – By Way of Introduction", in *SocRel* 58, pp.299-303.
- Blenkinsopp, J.
- 1981 "Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of Second Temple History", in E.P. Sanders with A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (eds), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition; Volume Two: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (London: SCM Press Ltd), pp.1-26.
- 2005 "The Qumran Sect in the Context of Second Temple Sectarianism", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.10-25.
- Boardman, J., J. Griffin and O. Murray (eds)
- 1991 *The Oxford History of the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Boccaccini, G.
- 1998 *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Boccaccini, G. (ed.)
- 2005 *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

- Bowley, J.E.
 1999 "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.354-378.
- Box, S.
 1971 *Deviance, Reality and Society* (London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Ltd).
- Boyce, M.
 1990 "The Poetry of the Damascus Document and its Bearing on the Origin of the Qumran Sect", in *RevQ* 14, pp.615-628.
- Brin, G.
 1995 "The Laws of the Prophets in the Sect of the Judaean Desert: Studies in 4Q375", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Qumran Questions* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp.28-60.
- Brooke, G.J.
 1980 "The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7.13b – 8.1a) and Messianic Expectation", in *ZAW* 92, pp.397-404.
 1981 "Qumran Peshar: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre", in *RevQ* 10, pp.483-503.
 1985 *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
 1991a "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document", in *RevQ* 15, pp.215-230.
 1991b "The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim", in L. Alexander (ed.), *Images of Empire* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp.135-159.
 1994a "The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.339-352.
 1994b "The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshar", in *DSD* 1, pp.160-179.
 1994c "The Thematic Content of 4Q252", in *JQR* 85, pp.33-59.
 1995 "4Q253: A Preliminary Edition", in *JSS* 40, pp.227-239.
 1996 "Commentaries on Genesis and Malachi", in G.J. Brooke *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*, DJD 22 (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.185-236.
 1998 "Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.271-301.

- 1999 "4Q252 and the 153 Fish of John 21:11", in B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold and A. Steudel (eds), *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), pp.253-265.
- 2000a "Catena", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.121-122.
- 2000b "Genesis, Commentary on", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.300-302.
- 2000c "*E Pluribus Unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.107-119.
- 2000d "Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.60-73.
- 2002 "Commentary on Malachi B (4Q253a)", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol.6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.244-247.
- 2004 "4Q252 (4QCommGen A)", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.106-111.
- 2005a "Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures", in M. Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.134-157.
- 2005b "Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding", in K. De Troyer and A. Lange (eds), *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.73-87.
- 2005c "The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction Between Higher and Lower Criticism", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.26-42.

Broshi, M.

- 1992 "Anti-Qumranic Polemics in the Talmud", in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea*

- Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991*, Vol.2 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.589-600.
- 2004 "The Dead Sea Scrolls, the Sciences and New Technologies", in *DSD* 11, pp.133-142.
- Broshi, M. (ed.)
 1992 *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Brown, R.E.
 1969 "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)", in M. Black (ed.), *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (London: SPCK), pp.37-44.
- Brownlee, W.H.
 1948 "The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll", in *BASOR* 112, pp.8-18.
 1949a "Further Light on Habakkuk", in *BASOR* 114, pp.9-10.
 1949b "Further Corrections of the Translation of the Habakkuk Scroll", in *BASOR* 116, pp.14-16.
 1951 "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *BA* 14, pp.54-76.
 1952 "The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash", in *BASOR* 126, pp.10-20.
 1959 *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature).
 1964 *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible: With Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah* (New York: Oxford University Press).
 1979 *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars Press).
 1982 "The Wicked Priest, the Man of Lies, and the Righteous Teacher – The Problem of Identity", in *JQR* 73, pp.1-37.
- Bruce, F.F.
 1956 *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Paternoster Press).
- Burrows, M.
 1956 *Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Secker & Warburg).
 1958 *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretations* (London: Secker & Warburg).
- Burrows, M. (ed.)
 1950 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol.1: The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research).

- 1951 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol.2, Fasc.2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research).

Callaway, P.R.

- 1988 *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
 1990 "Qumran Origins: From the *Doresh* to the *Moreh*", in *RevQ* 14, pp.637-650.
 1994 "Methodology, the Scrolls, and Origins", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.409-427.

Campbell, J.G.

- 1995a *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).
 1995b "Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?", in *JJS* 46, pp.143-156.
 1999 "The Historical-Critical Method and Late Second Temple Judaic Writings", in J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck (eds), *Judaism in Late Antiquity (Part 3, Volume 2); Where We Stand: Issues and Debates in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill), pp.1-22.
 2002 *Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Second Edition (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing).
 2004 *The Exegetical Texts* (London: T&T Clark International).
 2005 "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.43-68.

Campbell, J.G., W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds)

- 2005 *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International).

Carmi, I.

- 2000 "Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.881-888.

Carmignac, J.

- 1962a "Notes sur les Peshârîm", in *RevQ* 3, pp.505-538.

- 1962b *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness: The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, translated by K.G. Pedley (Baltimore: Helicon Press).
- Chalcraft, D.J. (ed.)
 2007 *Sectarianism in Early Judaism* (London: Equinox Press). [Forthcoming]
- Charlesworth, J.H.
 1980 "The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases Among the Qumran Essenes", in *RevQ* 10, pp.213-233.
 1991 "An Allegorical and Autobiographical Poem by the Moreh Has-Sedeq (1QH 8.4-11)", in M. Fishbane and E. Tov (eds), *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns), pp.295-307.
 2002 *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.)
 1983 *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Volume 1, Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).
 1994- *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, Vols 1-10 (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press).
- Charlesworth, J.H. and C.D. Elledge
 2002 "Unidentified Pesharim Fragments (4Q172 = 4QpUnid)", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol.6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.195-201.
- Charlesworth, J.H. and M.A. Knibb
 2000 "Community Organization", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.133-140.
- Chazon, E.G.
 1998 "Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.244-270.

- 1999 "A Case of Mistaken Identity: Testament of Naphtali (4Q215) and Time of Righteousness (4Q215^a)", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.110-123.
- Chazon, E.G. and M.E. Stone
- 1999 "4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215^a, olim 4QTNaphtali): A Preliminary Publication of Fragment 1 II", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.124-125.
- 2000 "215a. 4QTime of Righteousness", in S.J. Pfann *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*, DJD 36 (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.172-184.
- Clines, D.J.A. (ed.)
- 1993 *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Volume I, א* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 1995 *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Volume II, ב – ג* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 1996 *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Volume III, ד – ה* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 1998 *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Volume IV, ו – ז* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 2001 *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew: Volume V, ח – ט* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Cohen, S.J.D.
- 1989 "Roman Domination: The Jewish Revolt and the Destruction of the Second Temple", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple* (London: SPCK), pp.205-235.
- Collins, J.J.
- 1979 "Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P.R. Davies", in *VT* 29, pp.212-216.
- 1985 "Review: 'The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus Document'' by Philip R. Davies", in *JBL* 104, pp.530-533.
- 1992 "In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran", in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea*

Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991, Vol.1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.609-618.

- 1994a "Teacher and Messiah? The One Who Will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days", in E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.193-210.
- 1994b "Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.213-229.
- 1995a *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday).
- 1995b "The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Paris 1992*, SVT Vol.61 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.25-38.
- 1997 "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint (eds), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.74-90.
- 1999 "Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.403-430.
- 2000a "Eschatology", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.256-261.
- 2000b "The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.199-217.
- 2003 "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill), pp.97-111.
- 2006 "The Yahad and 'The Qumran Community'", in C. Hempel and J.M. Lieu (eds), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (Leiden: Brill), pp.81-96.

Collins, J.J. and D. Dimant

- 1994 "A Thrice-Told Hymn: A Response to Eileen Schuller", in *JQR* 85, pp.151-155.

Cook, E.M.

- 1998 "The Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.359-378.

Cross, F.M.

- 1976 "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran", in F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), pp.147-176.
- 1993 "The Historical Context of the Scrolls", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SPCK), pp.20-32.
- 1995 *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 1998 "Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.379-402.
- 2000 "Paleography", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.629-634.

Daise, M.A.

- 2000 "Biblical Creation Motifs in the Qumran Hodayot", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.293-305.

Davidson, B.

- 2002 *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers).

Davies, P.R.

- 1977 "Hasidim in the Maccabean Period", in *JJS* 28, pp.127-140.
- 1978 "Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll", in *VT* 28, pp.28-36.
- 1982 *Qumran* (Guildford: Lutterworth Press).
- 1983 *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
- 1985 "Eschatology at Qumran", in *JBL* 104, pp.39-55.
- 1987 *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1988 "The Teacher of Righteousness and the 'End of Days'", in *RevQ* 13, pp.313-317.
- 1989 "The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document", in G.J. Brooke (ed.), *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll; Manchester, December 1987* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp.201-210.
- 1990a "The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is 'Damascus'?", in *RevQ* 14, pp.503-519.

- 1990b "Halakhah at Qumran", in P.R. Davies and R.T. White (eds), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.37-50.
- 1992 "Redaction and Sectarianism in the Qumran Scrolls", in F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst and C.J. Labuschagne (eds), *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A.S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.152-163.
- 1994 "Communities in the Qumran Scrolls", in *PIBA* 17, pp.55-68.
- 1996 *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 2000a "Who Hid the Scrolls, and When? Reflections on Some Recent Proposals", in *QC* 9, pp.105-122.
- 2000b "The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document", in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery – Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998* (Leiden: Brill), pp.27-43.
- 2000c "Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.219-232.
- 2002 "Space and Sects in the Qumran Scrolls", in D.M. Gunn and P.M. McNutt (eds), *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp.81-98.
- 2005 "Sects from Texts: On the Problems of Doing a Sociology of the Qumran Literature", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.69-82.
- Davies, P.R., G.J. Brooke and P.R. Callaway
 2002 *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames & Hudson).
- Davila, J.R.
 2000 *Liturgical Works*, Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls Vol.6 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- de Moor
 1957 "Lexical Remarks Concerning Yahad and Yahdaw", in *VT* 7, pp.350-355.
- de Vaux, R.
 1973 *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press).

Dimant, D.

- 1984 "Qumran Sectarian Literature", in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Assen: Van Gorcum), pp.483-550.
- 1991 "Literary Typologies and Biblical Interpretation in the Hellenistic-Roman Period", in S. Talmon (ed.), *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.73-80.
- 1995 "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance", in D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman (eds), *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.23-58.
- 2000 "The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.170-176.

Donceel, R. and P. Donceel-Voûte

- 1994 "The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.1-38.

Donceel-Voûte, P.

- 1993 "'Coenaculum' – La salle à l'étage du locus 30 à Khirbet Qumrân sur la mer morte", in *Res Orientales* 4, pp.61-84.

Doudna, G.L.

- 1998 "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.430-471.
- 2001 *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 2003 "4Q Pesher Hosea^b: Reconstruction of Fragments 4, 5, 18, and 24", in *DSD* 10, pp.338-358.
- 2006 "The Legacy of an Error in Archaeological Interpretation: The Dating of the Qumran Cave Scroll Deposits", in K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert and J. Zangenberg (eds), *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates; Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (Leiden: Brill), pp.147-157.

Douglas, M.C.

- 1999 "The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux", in *DSD* 6, pp.239-266.

Driver, G.R.

- 1965 *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Dubnov, S.

- 1967 *History of the Jews, Vol.1: From the Beginning to Early Christianity* (South Brunswick: Thomas Yoseloff).

Duhaime, J.

- 1993 "Relative Deprivation in New Religious Movements and the Qumran Community", in *RevQ* 16, pp.265-276.
 2000a "Recent Studies on Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.789-799.
 2000b "Dualism", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol.1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.215-220.

Dupont-Sommer, A.

- 1954 *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, translated by R.D. Barnett (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co.).
 1961 *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, translated by G. Vermes (Oxford: Blackwell).

Eisenman, R.

- 1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians: Essays and Translations* (Shaftesbury: Element).

Eisenman, R. and M. Wise

- 1992 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Shaftesbury: Element).

Eissfeldt, O.

- 1968 "Renaming in the Old Testament", in P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (eds), *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.69-79.

- Elledge, C.D.
 2005 *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Elliott, J.H.
 1986 "Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: More on Methods and Models", in J.H. Elliot (ed.), *Semeia 35, Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and its Social World* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.1-33.
 1995 "The Jewish Messianic Movement: From Faction to Sect", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London: Routledge), pp.75-95.
- Elliott, J.H. (ed.)
 1986 *Semeia 35, Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and its Social World* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Elwolde, J.
 2000 "Distinguishing the Linguistic and the Exegetical: The Biblical Book of Numbers in the Damascus Document", in *DSD* 7, pp.1-25.
- Erikson, K.T.
 1989 "On the Sociology of Deviance", in D.H. Kelly (ed.), *Deviant Behaviour: A Text-Reader in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: St. Martin's Press), pp.63-70.
- Eshel, H.
 1999a "The Meaning and Significance of CD 20:13-15", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.330-336.
 1999b "The Identification of the 'Speaker' of the Self-Glorification Hymn", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.619-635.
 2002 "Qumran Studies in Light of Archeological Excavations Between 1967 and 1997", in *JRH* 26, pp.179-188.
- Eshel, H. and H.M. Cotton
 2000a "Hever, Nahal", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol.1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.357-361.

- 2000b "Se'elim, Naḥal", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.859-861.
- Esler, P.F.
- 1995 "Introduction: Models, Context and Kerygma in New Testament Interpretation", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London: Routledge), pp.1-20.
- 2005 "Social-Scientific Models in Biblical Interpretation", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context* (London: SCM Press), pp.3-14.
- Esler, P.F. (ed.)
- 1995 *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London: Routledge).
- 2005 *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context* (London: SCM Press).
- Esler, P.F. and A.C. Hagedorn
- 2005 "Social-Scientific Analysis of the Old Testament: A Brief History and Overview", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context* (London: SCM Press), pp.15-32.
- Evans, C.A.
- 1999 "'The Two Sons of Oil': Early Evidence of Messianic Interpretation of Zechariah 4:14 in 4Q254 4 2", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.566-575.
- 2000a "Diarchic Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Messianism of Jesus of Nazareth", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.558-567.
- 2000b "Messiahs", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.537-542.
- Fabry, H.-J.
- 2003 "The Reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran", in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill), pp.241-256.

Fassberg, S.E.

- 2000 "The Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective", in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery – Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998* (Leiden: Brill), pp.53-67.

Fields, W.W.

- 2000 "Discovery and Purchase", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.208-212.

Fitzmyer, J.A.

- 1975 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Missoula: Scholars Press).
 2000 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Flint, P.W.

- 1999 "'Apocrypha,' Other Previously-Known Writings, and 'Pseudepigrapha' in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.24-66.
 2005 "The Prophet David at Qumran", in M. Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.158-167.

Flusser, D.

- 1984 "Psalms, Hymns and Prayers", in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Assen: Van Gorcum), pp.551-577.

Freedman, D.N.

- 1949 "The 'House of Absalom' in the Habakkuk Scroll", in *BASOR* 114, pp.11-12.

Fröhlich, I.

- 1992 "Peshar, Apocalyptic Literature and Qumran", in J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991*, Vol.1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.295-305.
 1994 "Themes, Structure and Genre of Peshar Genesis: A Response to George J. Brooke", in *JQR* 85, pp.81-90.

- 1996 *'Time and Times and Half a Time': Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 1999 "Qumran Names", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.294-305.
- 2004 "Defining by Nicknames in Qumran Literature", paper given at IOQS 5th Meeting, Groningen 27-28 July 2004 ('Defining Identities: Who is the Other? We, You, and the Others in the Dead Sea Scrolls') [pp.1-9] – awaiting publication.
- Fujita, S.
- 1976 "The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period", in *JSJ* 7, pp.30-45.
- Fuller, R.E.
- 1992 "Textual Traditions in the Book of Hosea and the Minor Prophets", in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991*, Vol.1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.247-256.
- 1997 "The Twelve", in E. Ulrich *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, X: The Prophets*, DJD 15 (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.221-318.
- Galor, K., J.-B. Humbert and J. Zangenberg (eds)
- 2006 *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates; Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (Leiden: Brill).
- García Martínez, F.
- 1995a "The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect", in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*, translated by W.G.E. Watson (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.77-96.
- 1995b "Messianic Hopes in the Qumran Writings", in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices*, translated by W.G.E. Watson (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.159-189.
- 1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English*, Second Edition, translated by W.G.E. Watson (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- 1998a "The History of the Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts", in F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson (eds), *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp.194-216.

- 1998b "New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in F. García Martínez and E. Noort (eds), *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (Leiden: Brill), pp.230-248.
- 2002 "Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The 'I' of Two Qumran Hymns", in *ETL* 78, pp.321-339.
- García Martínez, F. and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds)
 1997 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill).
 1998 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill).
- García Martínez, F. and A.S. van der Woude
 1990 "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History", in *RevQ* 14, pp.521-541.
- Garfinkel, H.
 1956 "Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies", in *AJS* 61, pp.420-424.
- Gaster, T.H.
 1957 *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Secker & Warburg).
- Gibbs, J.P.
 1972 "Issues in Defining Deviant Behavior", in R.A. Scott and J.D. Douglas (eds), *Theoretical Perspectives on Deviance* (New York: Basic Books), pp.39-68.
- Glessmer, U.
 1999 "Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.213-278.
- Gmirkin, R.
 1998 "Historical Allusions in the War Scroll", in *DSD* 5, pp.172-214.
 2000 "The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.486-496.
- Golb, N.
 1994 "Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscript Finds of the Judaean Wilderness", in M.O. Wise et al. (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present*

- Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.51-72.
- 1995 *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?: The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner).
- Goldthorpe, J.E.
1974 *An Introduction to Sociology* (London: Cambridge University Press).
- Goranson, S.
1999 "Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic as Reflected in Qumran Texts", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.534-551.
- Gottstein, M.H.
1954 "Anti-Essene Traits in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *VT* 4, pp.141-147.
- Gottwald, N.K.
1979 *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250-1050 BCE* (London: SCM Press).
- Grabbe, L.L.
1994 *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (London: SCM Press Ltd).
1996 *An Introduction to First Century Judaism: Jewish Religion and History in the Second Temple Period* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
- Grossman, M.L.
2002 *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Method* (Leiden: Brill).
- Gunn, D.M. and P.M. McNutt (eds)
2002 *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Hagedorn, A.C.
2005 "Nahum – Ethnicity and Stereotypes: Anthropological Insights into Nahum's Literary History", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context* (London: SCM Press), pp.223-239.
- Hahn, F.
1969 *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (London: Lutterworth Press).

- Harding, M.
2002 "Introduction II: Recent History of Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship", in *JRH* 26, pp.145-156.
- Harkins, A.K.
2005 "Observations on the Editorial Shaping of the So-Called Community Hymns from 1QH^a and 4QH^a (4Q427)", in *DSD* 12, pp.233-256.
- Harris, J.G.
1966 *The Qumran Commentary on Habakkuk* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co.).
- Hempel, C.
1999a "Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in the Light of Recent Scholarship", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.316-329.
1999b "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.67-92.
2000 *The Damascus Texts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
2005 "The Groningen Hypothesis: Strengths and Weaknesses", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.249-255.
2006 "Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran", in C. Hempel and J.M. Lieu (eds), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (Leiden: Brill), pp.133-156.
- Hengel, M.
1974 *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, Vols 1-2 (London: SCM Press Ltd).
- Henze, M. (ed.)
2005 *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Hill, M.
1973 *A Sociology of Religion* (London: Heinemann Educational Books).
- Hirschfeld, Y.
2000 "The Architectural Context of Qumran", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress*,

- July 20-25, 1997 (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.673-683.
- 2004 *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers).
- 2006 "Qumran in the Second Temple Period – A Reassessment", in K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert and J. Zangenberg (eds), *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates; Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17-19, 2002* (Leiden: Brill), pp.223-239.
- Holladay, W.L.
2000 *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill).
- Holm-Nielsen, S.
1960 *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget I).
- Horbury, W.
1998 *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM Press Ltd).
- Horgan, M.P.
1979 *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America).
2002 "Pesharim", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol.6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.1-193.
- Horrell, D.
1997 "Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity", in *SocRel* 58, pp.323-341.
- Hutchesson, I.
1999 "63 BCE: A Revised Dating for the Deposition of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *QC* 8, pp.177-194.
- Hutt, C.
1999 "Qumran and the Ancient Sources", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.274-293.

Iwry, S.

- 1969 "Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of שְׂרָאֵל", in *EI* 9, pp.80-88.
- 1994 "The Exegetical Method of the Damascus Document Reconsidered", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.329-338.

Jacobson, H.

- 1993a "4Q252: Addenda", in *JJS* 44, pp.118-120.
- 1993b "4Q252 fr.1: Further Comments", in *JJS* 44, pp.291-293.

Jeremias, G.

- 1963 *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Jokiranta, J.

- 2001 "'Sectarianism' of the Qumran 'Sect': Sociological Notes", in *RevQ* 20, pp.223-239.
- 2005a "Pesharim: A Mirror of Self-Understanding", in K. De Troyer and A. Lange (eds), *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.23-34.
- 2005b "Qumran – The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context* (London: SCM Press), pp.254-263.

Kampen, J.I.

- 1998 "The Diverse Aspects of Wisdom in the Qumran Texts", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.211-243.

Kelly, D.H. (ed.)

- 1989 *Deviant Behaviour: A Text-Reader in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: St. Martin's Press).

Kim, S.H.

- 1985 *The Righteous and the Sage: A Comparative Study on the Ideal Images of Man in Biblical Israel and Classical China* (Seoul: Sogang University Press).

- Kittel, B.P.
 1981 *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (Chico: Scholars Press).
- Klassen, W.
 1996 *Judas: Betrayer or Friend of Jesus?* (London: SCM Press Ltd).
- Knibb, M.A.
 1983 "Exile in the Damascus Document", in *JSOT* 25, pp.99-117.
 1990 "The Teacher of Righteousness – A Messianic Title?", in P.R. Davies and R.T. White (eds), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.51-65.
 1991 "The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII, 9b – VIII, 2a and XIX, 5b-14", in *RevQ* 15, pp.243-251.
 1994a *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
 1994b "The Place of the Damascus Document", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.149-162.
 1999 "Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.379-402.
 2000a "Interpreter of the Law", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.383-384.
 2000b "Teacher of Righteousness", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.918-921.
- Knight, D.A.
 2002 "Joshua 22 and the Ideology of Space", in D.M. Gunn and P.M. McNutt (eds), *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp.51-63.
- Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner
 1994 *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Volume I, א – מ*, translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
 1995 *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Volume II, נ – ש*, translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

- 1996 *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Volume III, א – ז*, translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- 1999 *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Volume IV, ז – ט*, translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- 2000 *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Volume V, Aramaic, Supplementary Bibliography*, translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Kosmala, H.
- 1978a "At the End of the Days", in H. Kosmala, *Studies, Essays and Reviews: Vol.1, Old Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.73-83.
- 1978b "The Three Nets of Belial: A Study in the Terminology of Qumran and the New Testament", in H. Kosmala, *Studies, Essays and Reviews: Vol.2, New Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.115-137.
- 1978c "Maskîl", in H. Kosmala, *Studies, Essays and Reviews: Vol.1, Old Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.149-155.
- Kuhn, K.G.
- 1958 "The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel", in K. Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM Press), pp.54-64.
- Kuhn, K.G. (ed.)
- 1960 *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Lange, A.
- 2005 "Reading the Decline of Prophecy", in K. De Troyer and A. Lange (eds), *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.181-191.
- Lapp, N.L. and D.M. Gropp
- 2000 "Daliyeh, Wadi ed-", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol.1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.161-165.
- Lawrence, L.J.
- 2005 "'Men of Perfect Holiness' (1QS 7.20): Social-Scientific Thoughts on Group Identity, Asceticism and Ethical Development in the Rule of the Community", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.83-100.

- Lemert, E.M.
 1989 "Primary and Secondary Deviation", in D.H. Kelly (ed.), *Deviant Behaviour: A Text-Reader in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: St. Martin's Press), pp.195-200.
- Levine, L.I.A.
 1989 "The Age of Hellenism: Alexander the Great and the Rise and Fall of the Hasmonean Kingdom", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple* (London: SPCK), pp.177-204.
- Levy, R.
 1993 "'First Dead Sea Scroll' Found in Egypt Fifty Years Before Qumran Discoveries", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SPCK), pp.63-78.
- Lichtenberger, H.
 2003 "Qumran-Messianism", in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill), pp.323-333.
- Lied, L.I.
 2005 "Another Look at the Land of Damascus: The Spaces of the Damascus Document in the Light of Edward W. Soja's Thirdspace Approach", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.101-125.
- Lim, T.H.
 1993a "The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis", in *JBL* 112, pp.415-425.
 1993b "Notes on 4Q252 fr.1, cols.i-ii", in *JJS* 44, pp.121-126.
 1997 *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
 2000a "The Wicked Priest or the Liar?", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.45-51.
 2000b "Wicked Priest", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol.2* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.973-976.
 2000c "Liar", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol.1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.493-494.
 2002 *Pesharim* (London: Sheffield Academic Press).

- 2005 "The Translation of NDMW and Its Significance for the Groningen Hypothesis", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.291-293.
- Lipp, W.
 1977 "Charisma – Social Deviation, Leadership and Cultural Change: A Sociology of Deviance Approach", in *ARSSR* 1, pp.59-77.
- Lohse, E.
 1981 *Die Texte Aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch* (München: Kösel-Verlag).
- Macionis, J.J. and K. Plummer
 1998 *Sociology: A Global Introduction* (London: Prentice Hall Europe).
- Magness, J.
 1998 "Qumran Archaeology: Past Perspectives and Future Prospects", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.47-77.
 2000 "A Reassessment of the Excavations of Qumran", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.708-719.
 2002 *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Magness, J., H. Eshel and S. Talmon
 2000 "Masada", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.515-525.
- Malina, B.J.
 1995 "Early Christian Groups: Using Small Group Formation Theory to Explain Christian Organizations", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London: Routledge), pp.96-113.
- Malina, B.J. and J.H. Neyrey
 1993 "Conflict in Luke-Acts: Labelling and Deviance Theory", in J.H. Neyrey (ed.), *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers), pp.97-122.

- Mandel, P.
 2001 "Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *DSD* 8, pp.149-168.
- Mansoor, M.
 1961 *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
 1964 *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Mason, R.
 1997 *Propaganda and Subversion in the Old Testament* (London: SPCK).
- McCullough, W.S.
 1975 *The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod: 550 BC to 4 BC* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press).
- McNutt, P.M.
 2002 "'Fathers of the Empty Spaces' and 'Strangers Forever': Social Marginality and the Construction of Space", in D.M. Gunn and P.M. McNutt (eds), *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp.30-50.
- McQueen, R.A. and C. Knussen
 2002 *Research Methods for Social Science: A Practical Introduction* (Harlow: Pearson Education).
- Metso, S.
 1997 *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (Leiden: Brill).
 1998 "Constitutional Rules at Qumran", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.186-210.
 1999 "In Search of the *Sitz Im Leben* of the Community Rule", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.306-315.
 2000a "The Redaction of the Community Rule", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.377-384.
 2000b "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule", in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery – Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of*

- the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998* (Leiden: Brill), pp.85-93.
- 2004 "Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from Rule Texts Found at Qumran", in *DSD* 11, pp.315-335.
- 2006 "Whom Does the Term Yahad Identify?", in C. Hempel and J.M. Lieu (eds), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (Leiden: Brill), pp.213-235.
- Milgrom, J. with L. Novakovic
- 2002 "Catena A (4Q177 = 4QCat^a)", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol.6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.286-303.
- Milik, J.T.
- 1952 "Fragments d'un Midrash de Michée dans les Manuscrits de Qumran", in *RB* 59, pp.412-418.
- 1955 "Textes Non Bibliques", in D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, DJD 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.77-149.
- Morag, S.
- 1988 "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations", in *VT* 38, pp.148-164.
- Mowinckel, S.
- 1956 "Some Remarks on Hodayot 39.5-20", in *JBL* 75, pp.265-276.
- Mowry, L.
- 1962 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.
- 1970 "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14 – VI, 1", in *RB* 77, pp.201-229.
- 1971a "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2 – VIII, 3", in *RB* 78, pp.210-232.
- 1971b "The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14", in *HTR* 64, pp.379-386.
- 1972 "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX, 33 – XX, 34", in *RB* 79, pp.544-64.
- 1974 "The Essenes and Their History", in *RB* 81, pp.215-244.
- 1985 "The Damascus Document Revisited", in *RB* 92, pp.223-246.

- the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998* (Leiden: Brill), pp.85-93.
- 2004 "Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from Rule Texts Found at Qumran", in *DSD* 11, pp.315-335.
- 2006 "Whom Does the Term Yahad Identify?", in C. Hempel and J.M. Lieu (eds), *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (Leiden: Brill), pp.213-235.
- Milgrom, J. with L. Novakovic
- 2002 "Catena A (4Q177 = 4QCat^a)", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol.6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.286-303.
- Milik, J.T.
- 1952 "Fragments d'un Midrash de Michée dans les Manuscrits de Qumran", in *RB* 59, pp.412-418.
- 1955 "Textes Non Bibliques", in D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, DJD 1 (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.77-149.
- Morag, S.
- 1988 "Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations", in *VT* 38, pp.148-164.
- Mowinckel, S.
- 1956 "Some Remarks on Hodayot 39.5-20", in *JBL* 75, pp.265-276.
- Mowry, L.
- 1962 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- Murphy-O'Connor, J.
- 1970 "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14 – VI, 1", in *RB* 77, pp.201-229.
- 1971a "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2 – VIII, 3", in *RB* 78, pp.210-232.
- 1971b "The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2 = 19:5-14", in *HTR* 64, pp.379-386.
- 1972 "A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX, 33 – XX, 34", in *RB* 79, pp.544-64.
- 1974 "The Essenes and Their History", in *RB* 81, pp.215-244.
- 1985 "The Damascus Document Revisited", in *RB* 92, pp.223-246.

Najman, H.

- 2006 "Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism", in *DSD* 13, pp.99-113.

Neyrey, J.H. (ed.)

- 1993 *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers).

Nickelsburg, G.W.E.

- 1976 "Simon – A Priest with a Reputation for Faithfulness", in *BASOR* 223, pp.67-68.
 1992 "The Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4:29-40)", in J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991*, Vol.2 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.649-659.

Nielsen, E.

- 1961 *Oral Tradition: A Modern Problem in Old Testament Introduction* (London: SCM Press).

Nitzan, B.

- 1994 *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, translated by J. Chipman (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
 2000 "Absalom, House of", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.4-5.
 2003 "Approaches to Biblical Exegesis in Qumran Literature", in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill), pp.347-365.

Økland, J.

- 2005 "The Language of Gates and Entering: On Sacred Space in the Temple Scroll", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.149-165.

Parry, D.W. and E. Tov (eds)

- 2004a *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill).
 2004b *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 1: Texts Concerned with Religious Law* (Leiden: Brill).

- 2004c *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 4: Calendrical and Sapiential Texts* (Leiden: Brill).
- Patrich, J.
 2000 "Mird, Khirbet", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.563-566.
- Petersen, D.L.
 1991 "Israelite Prophecy: Change Versus Continuity", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989*, SVT Vol.43 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.190-203.
- Pfann, S.J.
 2000 "Archaeological Surveys", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.52-57.
 2004 "The Historical Implications of the Early Second Century Dating of the 4Q249-250 Cryptic A Corpus", in E.G. Chazon, D. Satran and R.A. Clements (eds), *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (Leiden: Brill), pp.171-186.
- Pietersen, L.K.
 1997 "Despicable Deviants: Labelling Theory and the Polemic of the Pastorals", in *SocRel* 58, pp.343-352.
 2004 *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity* (London: T&T Clark International).
 2005 "'False Teaching, Lying Tongues and Deceitful Lips' (4Q169 Frgs 3-4 2.8): The Pesharim and the Sociology of Deviance", in J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds), *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8-10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International), pp.166-181.
- Pietersma, A.
 1991 "The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989*, SVT Vol.43 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.383-395.
 2000 "Yohanah and his Brother", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.1000-1001.

Piovanelli, P.

- 2005 "Some Archaeological, Sociological, and Cross-Cultural Afterthoughts on the 'Groningen' and the 'Enochic/Essene' Hypotheses", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.366-372.

Polliack, M.

- 2005 "Wherein Lies the Pesher? Re-Questioning the Connection between Medieval Karaite and Qumranic Modes of Biblical Interpretation", in *JSIJ* 4, pp.151-200.

Puech, É.

- 1988 "Quelques aspects de la Restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)", in *JJS* 39, pp.38-55.
- 1994 "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament", in E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.235-256.
- 1999 "Le Grand Prêtre Simon (III) fils d'Onias III, le Maître de Justice?", in B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold and A. Steudel (eds), *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), pp.137-158.
- 2000 "Hodayot", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vol.1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.365-369.
- 2005 "The Essenes and Qumran, the Teacher and the Wicked Priest, the Origins", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.298-302.

Qimron, E.

- 1986 *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1992a "The Text of CDC", in M. Broshi (ed.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.9-49.
- 1992b "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E. – 200 C.E.) in the Light of the Dead Sea Documents", in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press), pp.349-361.
- 1995 "The Biblical Lexicon in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *DSD* 2, pp.295-329.

Rabin, C.

- 1955 "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll and the Zadokite Documents", in *VT* 5, pp.148-162.

Rabinowitz, I.

- 1950 "The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation-Scroll", in *JBL* 69, pp.31-49.
 1953 "Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll Texts and 'Damascus' Fragments", in *VT* 3, pp.175-185.
 1954 "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments", in *JBL* 73, pp.11-35.
 1958 "The Guides of Righteousness", in *VT* 8, pp.391-404.

Radday, Y.T.

- 1990 "Humour in Names", in Y.T. Radday and A. Brenner (eds), *On Humour and the Comic in the Hebrew Bible* (Sheffield: Almond Press), pp.59-97.

Rainbow, P.A.

- 1997 "The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness", in *JJS* 48, pp.30-52.

Rajak, T.

- 1990 "The Hasmoneans and the Uses of Hellenism", in P.R. Davies and R.T. White (eds), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.261-280.

Reeves, J.C.

- 1988 "The Meaning of Moreh Šedeq in the Light of 11QTorah", in *RevQ* 13, pp.287-298.

Regev, E.

- 2003 "The Yahad and the Damascus Covenant: Structure, Organization and Relationship", in *RevQ* 21, pp.233-262.
 2004 "Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish", in *Numen* 51, pp.146-181.

Reif, S.C.

- 2000 "The Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah: Its Discovery, Early Study and Historical Significance", in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery – Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea*

Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998 (Leiden: Brill), pp.109-131.

Rendtorff, R.

- 1988 "Between Historical Criticism and Holistic Interpretation: New Trends in Old Testament Exegesis", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986*, SVT Vol.40 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.298-303.

Richardson, H.N.

- 1955 "Some Notes on יָרָא and its Derivatives", in *VT* 5, pp.163-179.

Robbins, V.K.

- 1995 "Social-Scientific Criticism and Literary Studies: Prospects for Cooperation in Biblical Interpretation", in P.F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London: Routledge), pp.274-289.

Roberts, B.J.

- 1968 "Bible Exegesis and Fulfilment in Qumran", in P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (eds), *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.195-207.

Roberts, J.J.M.

- 1988 "Does God Lie? Divine Deceit as a Theological Problem in Israelite Prophetic Literature", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986*, SVT Vol.40 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.211-220.

Rock, P.

- 1973 *Deviant Behaviour* (London: Hutchinson University Library).

Rock, P. and M. McIntosh (eds)

- 1974 *Deviance and Social Control* (London: Tavistock Publications).

Rodd, C.S.

- 1981 "On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies", in *JSOT* 19, pp.95-106.

Rogerson, J.W.

- 1985 "The Use of Sociology in Old Testament Studies", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Salamanca 1983*, SVT Vol.36 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.245-256.

Roth, C.

- 1958 *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- 1960 "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis", in *VT* 10, pp.51-68.
- 1961 "The Era of the Habakkuk Commentary", in *VT* 11, pp.451-455.
- 1963 "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Prophecy of Joel", in *VT* 13, pp.91-95.

Rowley, H.H.

- 1952a *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
- 1952b "The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *The Expository Times* 63, pp.378-384.
- 1956 "4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness", in *JBL* 75, pp.188-193.
- 1958 "The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *BJRL* 40, pp.114-146.
- 1959 "The Qumran Sectaries and the Zealots: An Examination of a Recent Theory", in *VT* 9, pp.379-392.
- 1963 *From Moses to Qumran: Studies in the Old Testament* (London: Lutterworth Press).

Sanders, E.P.

- 2000 "The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.8-43.

Sanders, J.A.

- 1999 "The Impact of the Scrolls on Biblical Studies", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.47-57.

Sanders, J.T.

- 1993 *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations* (London: SCM Press Ltd).

Schäfer, P.

- 1977 "The Hellenistic and Maccabaeon Periods", in J.H. Hayes and J.M. Miller (eds), *Israelite and Judaeon History* (London: SCM Press Ltd), pp.539-604.

Schechter, S.

- 1970 *Documents of Jewish Sectaries* (New York: KTAV Publishing House).

Schiffman, L.H.

- 1991 "Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah", in S. Talmon (ed.), *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.138-146.
- 1993 "The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SPCK), pp.35-49.
- 1994 *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society).
- 2000a "The Relationship of the Zadokite Fragments to the Temple Scroll", in J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds), *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery – Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998* (Leiden: Brill), pp.133-145.
- 2000b "The Judean Scrolls and the History of Judaism", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.542-557.
- 2002 "The Many Battles of the Scrolls", in *JRH* 26, pp.157-178.
- 2003 "Utopia and Reality: Political Leadership and Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community", in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill), pp.413-427.
- 2005 "Contemporizing Halakic Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in K. De Troyer and A. Lange (eds), *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), pp.35-41.

Schiffman, L.H. and J.C. VanderKam (eds)

- 2000 *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Vols 1-2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Schniedewind, W.M.

- 1994 "King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism", in *JJS* 45, pp.71-78.
- 1999a "Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage", in *JBL* 118, pp.235-252.
- 1999b "Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the *Damascus Document*", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.523-536.

Schonfield, H.J.

- 1956 *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies Towards Their Solution* (London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co.).

Schuller, E.M.

- 1994a "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description", in *JQR* 85, pp.137-150.
 1994b "Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts from Qumran", in E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.153-171.
 1999 "Hodayot", in E. Chazon *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*, DJD 29 (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.69-254.
 2001 "Some Contributions of the Cave Four Manuscripts (4Q427-432) to the Study of the Hodayot", in *DSD* 8, pp.278-287.
 2006 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: What Have We Learned 50 Years On?* (London: SCM Press).

Schuller, E.M. and L. Ditommaso

- 1997 "A Bibliography of the Hodayot, 1948-1996", in *DSD* 4, pp.55-101.

Schur, E.M.

- 1971 *Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Implications* (New York: Harper & Row).
 1980 *The Politics of Deviance: Stigma Contests and the Uses of Power* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall).

Schürer, E. with G. Vermes and F. Millar

- 1973 *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*, Vol.1, revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar (Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark Ltd.).

Scott, R.A.

- 1972 "A Proposed Framework for Analyzing Deviance as a Property of Social Order", in R.A. Scott and J.D. Douglas (eds), *Theoretical Perspectives on Deviance* (New York: Basic Books), pp.9-35.

Scott, R.A. and J.D. Douglas (eds)

- 1972 *Theoretical Perspectives on Deviance* (New York: Basic Books).

Segal, M.

- 2005 "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible", in M. Henze (ed.), *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.10-28.

- Shanks, H.
1999 *The Mystery and Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Vintage Books).
- Shavit, Y.
1994 "The 'Qumran Library' in the Light of the Attitude Towards Books and Libraries in the Second Temple Period", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.299-317.
- Silberman, L.H.
1955 "The Two 'Messiahs' of the Manual of Discipline", in *VT* 5, pp.77-82.
- Simkins, R.A. and S.L. Cook with A. Brenner (eds)
1999 *Semeia* 87, *The Social World of the Hebrew Bible: Twenty Five Years of the Social Sciences in the Academy* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Skehan, P.W.
1959 "Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Masoretic Text", in *JBL* 78, pp.21-25.
- Smith, M.
1959 "What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?", in *JBL* 78, pp.66-72.
- Snyder, H.G.
2000 "Naughts and Crosses: Peshier Manuscripts and their Significance for Reading Practices at Qumran", in *DSD* 7, pp.26-48.
- Soggin, J.A.
1999 *An Introduction to the History of Israel and Judah* (London: SCM Press).
- Soja, E.W.
1996 *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers).
1999 "Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination", in D. Massey, J. Allen and P. Sarre (eds), *Human Geography Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press), pp.260-278.

Stanton, G.N.

- 1993 "Matthew's Gospel and the Damascus Document in Sociological Perspective", in G.N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.86-106.

Stark, W.

- 1967 *The Sociology of Religion: A Study of Christendom, Volume Two, Sectarian Religion* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).

Steckoll, S.H.

- 1967 "The Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis", in *RevQ* 6, pp.55-69.

Stegemann, H.

- 1971 *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: privately published).
 1990 "Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments", in L.H. Schiffman (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.189-220.
 1991 "The 'Teacher of Righteousness' and Jesus: Two Types of Religious Leadership in Judaism at the Turn of the Era", in S. Talmon (ed.), *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.196-213.
 1992 "The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times", in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991, Vol.1* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.83-166.
 1993 "How to Connect Dead Sea Scroll Fragments", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SPCK), pp.245-255.
 1998 *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
 2000 "The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.272-284.

Stern, E. and H. Eshel

- 2000 "Murabba'at, Wadi", in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol.1* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.581-586.

Stern, S.M.

- 1950 "Notes on the New Manuscript Find", in *JBL* 69, pp.19-30.
- 2000 "Qumran Calendars: Theory and Practice", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.179-186.

Steudel, A.

- 1992 "4QMidrEschat: 'A Midrash on Eschatology' (4Q174 + 4Q177), in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (eds), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991*, Vol.2 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.531-541.
- 1993 "אחרית הימים in the Texts From Qumran", in *RevQ* 16, pp.225-245.
- 2000 "God and Belial", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.332-340.

Stone, M.E. (ed.)

- 1984 *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Assen: Van Gorcum).

Strugnell, J.

- 1970 "Notes en Marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'", in *RevQ* 7, pp.163-276.

Strugnell, J. and E. Schuller

- 1999 "Further Hodayot Manuscripts from Qumran?", in B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold and A. Steudel (eds), *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), pp.51-72.

Stuckenbruck, L.T.

- 2005 "The Plant Metaphor in Its Inner-Enochic and Early Jewish Context", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.210-212.

Sukenik, E.L. (ed.)

- 1955 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press).

Sumner, C.

- 1996 *The Sociology of Deviance: An Obituary* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Talmon, S.

- 1951 "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll", in *VT* 1, pp.33-37.
 1953 "The Sectarian תנ"ך – A Biblical Noun", in *VT* 3, pp.133-140.
 1978 "The 'Comparative Method' in Biblical Interpretation – Principles and Problems", in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977*, SVT Vol.29 (Leiden: E.J. Brill), pp.320-356.
 1989 *The World of Qumran From Within: Collected Studies* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
 1991a "The Internal Diversification of Judaism in the Early Second Temple Period", in S. Talmon (ed.), *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.16-43.
 1991b "Between the Bible and the Mishnah: Qumran From Within", in S. Talmon (ed.), *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.214-257.
 1994a "The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity", in E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.3-24.
 1994b "Qumran Studies: Past, Present, and Future", in *JQR* 85, pp.1-31.
 1999 "Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the 'Community of the Renewed Covenant'", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.379-395.
 2003 "The Signification of אחרית הימים and אחרית in the Hebrew Bible", in S.M. Paul et al. (eds), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill), pp.795-810.
 2005 "Comments Concerning the 'Qumran-Essenes' Hypothesis", in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.294-297.

Teicher, J.L.

- 1954 "The Habakkuk Scroll", in *JJS* 5, pp.47-59.

Theissen, G.

- 1978 *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity*, translated by J. Bowden (London: SCM Press Ltd).

Thiering, B.

- 1978 "Once More the Wicked Priest", in *JBL* 97, pp.191-205.
- 1992 *Jesus the Man: A New Interpretation from the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: BCA).
- 2000 "The Date and Order of Scrolls, 40 BCE to 70 CE", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.191-198.

Thompson, T.L.

- 1999 *The Bible in History: How Writers Create a Past* (London: Jonathan Cape).

Thorion-Vardi, T.

- 1985 "The Use of the Tenses in the Zadokite Documents", in *RevQ* 12, pp.65-88.

Tiller, P.A.

- 1997 "The 'Eternal Planting' in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in *DSD* 4, pp.312-335.

Tov, E.

- 1991 "Hebrew Bible Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism", in S. Talmon (ed.), *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.107-137.
- 1994 "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod", in E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.111-134.
- 1998 "Scribal Practices Reflected in the Texts From the Judaean Desert", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.403-429.
- 1999 "Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert", in D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich (eds), *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill), pp.232-263.
- 2000 "Further Evidence for the Existence of a Qumran Scribal School", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.199-216.
- 2002 "Copying of a Biblical Scroll", in *JRH* 26, pp.189-209.

- Tov, E. (ed.)
 2002 *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series*, DJD 39 (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Trafton, J.L.
 2002 "Commentary on Genesis. A (4Q252 = 4QCommGen A = 4QP Bless)", in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Vol.6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents*, The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press), pp.203-219.
- Trebolle-Barrera, J.
 2000 "Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.89-106.
- Trompf, G.W.
 2002 "Introduction I: The Long History of Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship", in *JRH* 26, pp.123-144.
- Ulfgard, H.
 2000 "The Branch in the Last Days: Observations on the New Covenant Before and After the Messiah", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.233-247.
- Ulrich, E.
 1999 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
 2000 "The Qumran Biblical Scrolls – The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism", in T.H. Lim (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark), pp.67-87.
 2001 "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran", in P.W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans), pp.51-66.
- VanderKam, J.C.
 1993a "The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SPCK), pp.50-62.
 1993b "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christianity", in H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SPCK), pp.181-202.

- 1994a *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- 1994b "Messianism in the Scrolls", in E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), pp.211-234.
- 1999a "Identity and History of the Community", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.2 (Leiden: Brill), pp.487-533.
- 1999b "The Judean Desert and the Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls", in B. Kollmann, W. Reinbold and A. Steudel (eds), *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), pp.159-171.
- 2003 "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law", in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill), pp.465-477.
- VanderKam, J.C. and P.W. Flint
- 2002 *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco).
- van de Water, R.
- 2003 "The Punishment of the Wicked Priest and the Death of Judas", in *DSD* 10, pp.395-419.
- van der Ploeg, J.
- 1958 *The Excavations at Qumran: A Survey of the Judaean Brotherhood and its Ideas*, translated by K. Smyth (London: Longmans, Green and Co).
- van der Woude, A.S.
- 1982 "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary", in *JJS* 33, pp.349-359.
- 1998 "Fifty Years of Qumran Research", in P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, Vol.1 (Leiden: Brill), pp.1-45.
- Vermes, G.
- 1975 *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill).
- 1977 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: SCM Press).
- 1981 "The Essenes and History", in *JJS* 32, pp.18-31.

- 1989 "Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature", in *JSS* 34, pp.493-508.
- 2001 *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: SCM Press).
- 2002 "Significance of the Scrolls for Understanding Christianity", in *JRH* 26, pp.210-219.
- 2004 *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin Books).
- Victor, P.
- 1966 "A Note on $\overline{\text{p}}\overline{\text{n}}$ in the Old Testament", in *VT* 16, pp.358-361.
- Wacholder, B.Z.
- 1988 "Does Qumran Record the Death of the Moreh? The Meaning of he'aseph in Damascus Covenant XIX.35, XX.14", in *RevQ* 13, pp.323-330.
- 1990 "The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500-164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts", in L.H. Schiffman (ed.), *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.257-281.
- Warren, C.A.B. and J.M. Johnson
- 1972 "A Critique of Labeling Theory from the Phenomenological Perspective", in R.A. Scott and J.D. Douglas (eds), *Theoretical Perspectives on Deviance* (New York: Basic Books), pp.69-92.
- Wassen, C.
- 2005 *Women in the Damascus Document* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Weber, M.
- 1966 *The Sociology of Religion*, translated by E. Fischhoff (London: Methuen).
- Werman, C.
- 2000 "The Sons of Zadok", in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp.623-630.
- 2006 "Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature", in *DSD* 13, pp.229-255.

Wernberg-Møller, P.

- 1953 "צדק, צדיק and צדוק in the Zadokite Fragments (CDC), the Manual of Discipline (DSD) and the Habakkuk-Commentary (DSH)", in *VT* 3, pp.310-315.

White, L.M.

- 1988 "Shifting Sectarian Boundaries in Early Christianity", in *BJRL* 70, pp.7-24.

White, R.T.

- 1990 "The House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls", in P.R. Davies and R.T. White (eds), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp.67-98.

White Crawford, S.

- 1987 "A Comparison of the 'A' and 'B' Manuscripts of the Damascus Document", in *RevQ* 12, pp.537-553.

Wiesenberg, E.

- 1955 "Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments", in *VT* 5, pp.284-308.

Wilcox, M.

- 1969 "Dualism, Gnosticism, and Other Elements in the Pre-Pauline Tradition", in M. Black (ed.), *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (London: SPCK), pp.83-96.

Wise, M.O.

- 1994 "An Annalistic Calendar from Qumran", in M.O. Wise *et al.* (eds), *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences), pp.389-408.
- 1999 *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior Before Jesus* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco).
- 2003 "Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the Floruit of his Movement", in *JBL* 122, pp.53-87.

Wise, M.O., M.G. Abegg Jr. and E.M. Cook

- 1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: HarperCollins).

Wise, M.O., M.G. Abegg Jr. and E.M. Cook with N. Gordon

- 2004a "1QpHab", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.78-93.

- 2004b "1Q14 (1QpMic)", in D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, Part 2: Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill), pp.66-71.
- Worrell, J.
 1970 "עצת: 'Counsel' or 'Council' at Qumran?", in *VT* 20, pp.65-74.
- Young, I.
 2002 "The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?", in *DSD* 9, pp.364-390.
- Zeitlin, S.
 1952 "Bar Kokba and Bar Kozeba", in *JQR* 43, pp.77-82.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

Holy Bible: New Revised Standard Version with Apocrypha (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

Josephus

- 1927 *The Jewish War: Books I-III*, Loeb Classical Library, Vol. II, translated by H.St.J. Thackeray (London: William Heinemann Ltd.).
- 1943 *Jewish Antiquities: Books XII-XIV*, Loeb Classical Library, Vol. VII, translated by R. Marcus (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- 1963 *Jewish Antiquities: Books XIV-XV*, Loeb Classical Library, A. Wikgren (ed.), translated by R. Marcus (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- 1965 *Jewish Antiquities: Books XVIII-XX*, Loeb Classical Library, Vol. IX, translated by L.H. Feldman (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- 1997 *The Jewish War: Books III-IV*, Loeb Classical Library, translated by H.St.J. Thackeray (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).